DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 646 EA 028 510

AUTHOR	Luisoni, Pierre
TITLE	What Secondary Education for a Changing Europe? Trends, Challenges and Prospects. Report of the Final Conference of the project "A Secondary Education for Europe," (Strasbourg, France, December 2-5, 1996).
INSTITUTION	Council for Cultural Cooperation, Strasbourg (France).
PUB DATE	97
NOTE	123p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Cooperation; Educational Objectives; *Educational Policy; Foreign Countries; *International Cooperation; *International Education; International Programs; Policy Formation; Role of Education; *Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Council for Cultural Cooperation (France); *Europe

ABSTRACT

The final conference of the Council for Cultural Co-operation's project, "A Secondary Education for Europe," was held in Strasbourg, France, in December 1996. The conference was entitled "What Secondary Education for a Changing Europe?" and was attended by approximately 140 participants from European countries. The project sought to: (1) develop a model that would give young people the knowledge, competencies, and attitudes that they will need to meet the major challenges of European society; (2) prepare young people for higher education and for mobility, work, and daily life in a democratic, multilingual and multicultural Europe; and (3) make young people aware of their common cultural heritage and their shared responsibilities as Europeans. Although the project is a long way from describing a European model for secondary education, important markers have been delineated: quality for all, effectiveness and efficiency, democratic management, the European dimension, and citizenship. Appendices contain speeches by Gabor Halasz and by Jean Michel Leclercq, a presentation of the project activities during 1991-96, the conference program, and a list of participants. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Council of Europe
Conseil de l'Europe

DECS/SE/Sec (96) 54 prov.

ED 409 646

What secondary education for a changing Europe? - Trends, challenges and prospects

Strasbourg, 2-5 December 1996

Report of the Final Conference of the project "A secondary education for Europe"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. Borch-Jacobsen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 028 510

Council for Cultural Co-operation
A secondary Education for Europe

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Strasbourg, 1997

The **Council of Europe** was founded in 1949 to achieve greater unity between European parliamentary democracies. It is the oldest of the European political institutions and has 40 member States*, including the 15 members of the European Union. It is the widest intergovernmental and interparliamentary grouping in Europe, and has its headquarters in the French city of Strasbourg.

Only questions related to national defence are excluded from the Council of Europe's work, and the Organisation has activities in the following areas: democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms; media and communication; social and economic affairs; education, culture, heritage and sport; youth; health; environment and regional planning; local democracy; and legal co-operation.

The **European Cultural Convention** was opened for signature in 1954. This international treaty is open to European countries that are not members of the Council of Europe, and it enables them to take part in the Organisation's programmes on education, culture, sport and youth. So far, 47 States have acceded to the European Cultural Convention: the Council of Europe's full member States plus Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovinia, Georgia, the Holy See and Monaco.

The **Council for Cultural Co-operation (the CDCC)** is responsible for the Council of Europe's work on education and culture. Four specialised committees - the Education Committee, the Committee for Higher Education and Research, the Culture Committee and the Cultural Heritage Committee - help the CDCC to carry out its tasks under the European Cultural Convention. There is also a close working relationship between the CDCC and the regular conferences of specialised European ministers responsible for education, culture and cultural heritage.

The CDCC's programmes are an integral part of the Council of Europe's work, and, like the programmes in other sectors, they contribute to the Organisation's three over-arching policy objectives for the 1990s:

- the protection, reinforcement and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms and pluralist democracy;
- the promotion of an awareness of European identity;
- the search for common responses to the great challenges facing European society.

The CDCC's education programme covers school, higher and adult education, as well as educational research. At present, there are projects on: education for democratic values; history; modern languages; school links and exchanges; the reform of secondary education; access to higher education; the reform of legislation on higher education in Central and Eastern Europe; academic mobility, and educational documentation and research.

---

* Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

DECS/SE/Sec/ (96) 54 prov.

COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL COOPERATION (CDCC)

What secondary education for a changing Europe? - Trends, challenges and prospects

Strasbourg, 2-5 December 1996

Report of the final conference of the project "A secondary education for Europe"

Written by
Pierre LUISONI,

Table of Contents

Page

I. **OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE** 1

1.1. Introduction 1

1.2. Objectives 1

1.3. Organisation of the conference 1

1.3.1 Opening 2
a. Address by Mr Ivan Pilip 2
b. Address by Mr Peter Leuprecht 7
c. Address by Mr Maitland Stobart 10

1.3.2 Evaluation of the success of the project "A secondary education for Europe" (see chapter 2 of this report) 15

1.3.3 First part of the group deliberations 15

1.3.4 Address by Mr Jaak Aaviksoo (Estonia) 15

1.3.5 Second part of the group deliberations 16

1.3.6 Round Table on the European dimension 17

1.3.7 General report 18

1.3.8 Bringing the conference to a close 18

II. **ASSESSMENT** 19

2.1 Overall assessment, by Pierre Luisoni, Chairman of the Project Group 19

2.2 Evaluation of the work of the general element, by Denis Kallen, coordinator 26

2.3 Evaluation of the work of the specific element by Jean-Pierre Titz, Project leader at the DECS Secretariat 32

III. **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AT THE FINAL CONFERENCE** 36

Preliminary comments 36

3.1. Introduction 37

A world of tension... 37
A Europe of tension... 38
Tensions and education 39
Five general observations 39

3.2 Trends and challenges 41

Secondary education for all 41
Finding a balance between aims and objectives 42
Redefinition of general culture 43
The role of the State: education and training a "public asset" 44

3.3 Prospects and strategies 46

Structures 46
Managing the system and partnerships 50
Content and methods of learning 52
Evaluation and assessment 53
Human resources 54
Innovation and the reform process 57

3.4 The European dimension 59

General comments 59
Prospects 60
Strategies 61

3.5 The post-project period 62

IV. BY WAY OF CONCLUSION 64

ANNEXES 66

A. Speech by Gabor Halasz: introduction to the 1st part of the works of the groups 67

B. Speech by Jean-Michel Leclercq: introduction to the 2d part of the works of the groups 83

C. Presentation of the project – 1991 to 1996 93

D. Programme of the final conference 101

E. List of participants 104

I. OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE

1.1. Introduction

Entitled "What secondary education for a changing Europe? Trends, challenges and prospects", the final conference of the project "A Secondary Education for Europe" was held at the Palais de l'Europe in Strasbourg from 2 to 5 December 1966. It was attended by around 140 participants: delegates from the governments of the 44 signatory States of the Cultural Convention, observers, representatives of international organisations (UNESCO, European Union), other organs of the Council of Europe and non-governmental international organisations, experts and members of the Project Group, and members of the Secretariat of the Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport (DECS). The complete **list of participants** is given in **Annex E**.

1.2. Objectives

The final conference set itself the following principal objectives:

- to present the results of activities undertaken between 1991 and 1996 and assess their success,
- to announce a number of conclusions or key elements likely to inform educational policy at national level,
- to open up perspectives and courses of action with a view to achieving cooperation in education matters, particularly within the Council of Europe.

The final conference should consequently be seen as both a culmination and a starting point because it constitutes a first and very important stage in the strategy for disseminating the results of the project.

1.3. Organisation of the conference

The work of the conference followed the proposed programme as shown in **Annex D**, with plenary sessions alternating with working groups.

1.3.1. Opening

The conference was opened by Pierre Luisoni (Switzerland), Chairman of the Project Group, who welcomed the participants and particularly thanked the three speakers who had been invited to the opening session. The floor was then taken by Messrs Ivan Pilip, Minister of Education of the Czech Republic, Peter Leuprecht, Assistant Secretary-General of the Council of Europe and Maitland Stobart, Deputy Director of DECS in succession.

a. Address by M. Ivan Pilip, Ministry of Education of the Czech Repulic

Dear Mr Deputy General Secretary, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Colleagues,

Allow me to express at the outset my deep satisfaction with the fact that I can be with you in this palace which has become in the course of time a kind of a symbol and personification of Europe for milions of its citizens. It is an honour for me to be invited to open this final conference devoted to the Project „A Secondary Education for Europe“ in which the work of a great number of experts lasting many years culminates. It has been remarkable effort to find within, possibly the most significant educational project of the Council of Europe in recent years, an answer to the question of how to devise the optimum system of secondary education. Secondary education has become beyond any doubt the most important part of the education systems in Europe in the sense that it has the leading role in the realization of shared philosophical and pedagogical principles of education as well as in fulfilling the career aspirations of young citizens in a democratic Europe.

The project which started five years ago had a main goal which correlated with the previous educational engagements of the Council of Europe and stressed the primary needs of the member states. We must bear in mind that young people must be constantly prepared for everyday contact with multi-cultural and multi-lingual reality of Europe and thus accept their share of responsibility for the future development of Europe. Following the profound political and economic changes in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe during the years 1989 - 1991 many educational objectives of the Council of Europe to a large degree corresponded with the objective needs of the new member states. Their education systems underwent various degrees of radical transformation. The European dimension in the Project, with the accent on European values of plurality, tolerance, and freedom of thinking, manifested itself in the political will of joint effort to solve common problems. The European dimension enriched the new concept of the mission of education systems and the awareness of the significance of education for society and for the individual.

The mission of the education systems is to provide for all individuals such education that will develop their abilities and cultivate their character and attitudes. It shall equip them with the necessary knowledge and skills to realize fully their career potential and enable them to exercise their rights and fulfil their duties as free citizens in a democratic society. The aim of education is to contribute to the formation of personality combining within itself both freedom and responsibility.

For society education represents a significant integrating force which through passing on and developing shared values, maintains its contunuity and internal cohesion. It is an important dimension of quality of life, it is a prerequisite of the continuation of democratic development and it underpins political and social stability. It is an important prerequisite for economic growth and for the capability to succeed in a competitive world.

The concept of „the European dimension“ has played an important and inspiring role since the beginning of the Project. The new concept has been worked out within the European context thus giving the reform a true European dimension. It is also greatly in evidence given the active participation of representatives of new member states in the previous symposia. One of these sessions took place in Prague in October 1995 at the invitation of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport and the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic. The topic of this symposium was „Educational Reforms in Central and Eastern Europe: Processes and Outcomes“. The reason why I am mentioning it is, not that it was held in Prague, but because I would like to demonstrate the undeniable value of such international gatherings for the domestic climate, in which the debate on educational policies takes place. The results of the symposium stimulated new thought concerning the possible changes in the Czech education system, the transformation of which deals primarily with the developmenmt of secondary education. Since 1990 secondary education sector can be regarded as the most dynamic sector due to its dramatic expansion and experience of profound change. The symposium took place in the time when the social and economic changes had influenced the internal conditions and functioning of the education system and when the strengthening of the administration, economic and pedagogical autonomy of the schools had become a reality. Nowadays the burning issue is the necessity for active educational policy aimed at the growth, evaluation and quality assesment of secondary schools. It is necessary to improve the effectiveness of the education system, to define the relationship between upper secondary general education and professional education including vocational training. From the political point of view it is also important to create a balanced and democratic relationship between the main partners in secondary education, namely the school on the one hand and the stakeholders in education on the other. It concerns pupils and parents, municipality, regions, the world of labour and - last but not least - the state. Naturally equitable access to education is also a prerequisite. It is necessary to pay attention to the quality of education, since evaluation and quality assurance are key elements in a system of steering which is based mainly on the educational outputs of autonomous schools.

The successful achievement of all these goals relies upon a high level of participation and support from the general public. The changes in education can be succesful only if both teachers and other citizens understand them and if they understand their necessity and identify with them.

Maybe other member countries would have stressed different themes in their education policy reforms, or a different list of priorities and time frame depending on the local political and economic development, or national educational traditions. However, the sharing of common values and awareness of common goals is a framework, in which such projects as „ A Secondary Education for Europe" and its working instruments /seminars, symposia, development of teaching materials, monographs and so on/ might become a catalyst for discussions on education issues in each country. In this particular sense this project, which is near completion has played a significant role and the authorities of the Council of Europe deserve appreciation and gratitude from the member states involved.

I have studied with interest the questions for the working groups, one of the working documents of this final conference. I have to admit that I am anxious to know the outcomes and recommendations which will result from the discussion. If it were possible to find one universal correct answer, many of the ministers of education in Europe would better sleep. Of course, this is not the case, since the questions submitted for discussion are too complex to arrive at one single answer for all of them. In spite of this I am convinced that this conference will be a milestone in the process of searching for an optimum educational policy in Europe.

The European countries have given a clear signal of their responsibility for the future of our European homeland and the prospective role of education through their decision to make use of the political potential of the oldest multilateral European organization for their joint activities in this area. By initiating the project „ A Secondary Education for Europe“ five years ago the member countries of the Council of Europe made a decision to take a determined step on their way to achieve a common educational goal. It was not the last step as is illustrated by the fact that there now exist three preliminary projects of the Council of Europe for 1998 - 2000. One of them, entitled „ Education for Democratic Citizenship „ can be considered as a follow-up of the finished project on Secondary Education.

I am convinced that this new project has a good chance to be approved at the conference of Ministers of Education of member countries of the Council of Europe, which will be held in Norway next June.

Education is an unending process, as is the historical, social and political development of individual states and our European homeland as a whole. It is an unceasing task to improve and cultivate the world and it places those of us who have the opportunity to influence the shape of the education processes and institutions under great obligation. Let us do everything to make our influence in achieving our common objectives as positive as possible. We have in our hands, great potential to shape the future development of Europe. We should be aware of this fact. We should hold it in high regard and weigh our responsibilities before making decisions.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am fortunate to be the Minister of Education of the country which gave birth to Comenius, the founder of modern pedagogical thinking, philosopher and humanist. Over the centuries his ideas still hold a message in their pedagogical urgency. I am sure that you will accept with understanding, when I finish my speech with the quotation from Comenius´ work „General Consultation about the Improvement of Human Affairs". In the chapter Pampaedia Comenius reflected why universal education is so needed for all people. He wrote:

„ Firstly, the expressed wish is for full power of development into full humanity not of one particular person or a few or even many, but of every single individual, young and old, rich and poor, noble and ignoble, men and women - in a word, of every human being born on earth, with the ultimate aim of providing education to the entire human race regardless of age, class, sex and nationality.

Secondly, our wish is that every human being should be rightly developed and perfectly educated not in any limited sense but in every respect that makes for the perfection of human nature, to know the truth and not be deluded by the false, to love the good and not be lead astray by the evil, to do one´s duty and avoid temptation. For if all men were taught all this, they would all become wholly wise, and the world would be full of order, light and peace".

I would like to wish you all full success with this conference. Thank you for your attention.

b. Address by M. Peter Leuprecht, Deputy Secretary General of the Conseil de l'Europe

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is my great pleasure to welcome you all here today to the Council of Europe.

We are aware of the honour you are doing us, Minister, in having agreed to open this conference and, in particular, having delivered a speech in which you reminded us that you come from the country which gave us Comenius.

The closing conference of the "A secondary education for Europe" project, which opens today, rounds off an enterprise begun in 1991 whose findings are to be presented at the XIXth meeting of the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education in Kristiansand, Norway, in June 1997. Over the coming days, here in Strasbourg, you will have the opportunity to work together on meeting the challenges and making the political choices that secondary education - and education in general - must deal with in today's Europe.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the project group and its Chair, Mr Luisoni, whose dynamism is reflected in the wealth of project results.

For my part, I should like to share with you some thoughts which are dear to me and which seem to me to set your work in context.

First of all, I should like to remind you of something obvious: co-operation in the field of education has been part and parcel of the Council of Europe's work since its creation in 1949 and that is no accident. The founding fathers, spurred on by the desire to construct a Europe at peace with itself and respectful of human rights and pluralist democracy, understood that the defence and the promotion of these values only made sense if they were accompanied by resolute action in the field of training young men and women, the future citizens of a finally reconciled continent. In this spirit, the European Cultural Convention of 1954 may be regarded as the other side of the same coin as the European Convention on Human Rights, which it somehow complements. With that Convention in place, each activity and each project implemented ever since has had to be another building-block, an attempt to translate into the practice of educational systems the values which unite us.

In this respect, the project whose work we are completing this week found itself at the crossroads of our continent's history. Begun just as the obstacles inherited from the cold war were collapsing one after another, it is now coming to an end, in the presence of the representatives of 47 European states, in an open Europe rediscovering its reality and historic heritage as a unity not only of cultures and histories but also of similar projects.

Myself the national of a central European country, I am aware of the need which we must meet, that of devising a new vision of Europe, now that it is freed from the Iron Curtain. I myself saw the old division of our continent as anti-cultural and anti-historical. Now we must be careful not to replace yesterday's walls with new ones - in particular in our heads.

What, therefore, can this vision of Europe be?

May I first of all sketch, in six points, my perhaps somewhat personal view.

1. If it is to be a solid and lasting construction, Europe must, above all, be a community of shared values, as the Council of Europe is supposed to be. Which values?

   * a certain conception of humanity, its unalienable dignity, fundamental human rights and each individual's place in society;

   * pluralist democracy;

   * the rule of law.

   These shared values, re-asserted at the Vienna Summit in October 1993, should be a feature of European society, European construction and European action throughout the world.

2. If these values were to affect the building of Europe, it would be:

   * more democratic;
   * closer to the citizens;
   * a framework where people can be and act as citizens.

   I am thinking of a pluralistic city/polis, where civic attitudes may be exercised in several circles, preferably concentric: municipality, region, state, Europe.

   This vision, which may be qualified as "federalist", would be easier to achieve if subsidiarity were not just a slogan but a real-life experience.

3. Europe should throw off the shackles of pan-economic ideology, that new determinism - objectively close to the Marxist ideology which we thought we had overcome. Europe must reduce its deficits

   * of democracy;
   * of solidarity and social justice;
   * of meaning and significance.

   Europe must give meaning, content, to its freedom. As John Locke taught us in his day, this must go hand in hand with equality and responsibility. Freedom in Europe must be a responsible freedom.

4. Europe must be both united and plural, not a "melting pot". We must construct a multicultural and tolerant Europe which perceives diversity not as a handicap but as what it is: something immensely enriching.

5. Europe must not be a selfish and inward-looking fortress, but an open and brotherly continent of solidarity.

6. Finally, I dream of a Europe which makes people dream, about which citizens may rightly have a feeling of belonging and in which they have a genuine opportunity to participate.

As emerges very clearly from the summary reports submitted to you, it is initially by values and the desire to work out a common scheme for society that we can turn into action the Europe of which I have just offered you a somewhat personal vision.

In terms of education policies that means: guaranteeing everyone the chance to exploit all the potential that they have at birth and forming aware and responsible citizens who through their personal and professional lives and their actions as citizens can help to strengthen social cohesion and democratic security, the main objectives set at the Vienna Summit.

The dialogue on education policies which has developed as a result of this project - and which has, in particular, enabled account to be taken rapidly of the new situation created in states freed from authoritarian regimes - has been both exemplary and encouraging. It has been demonstrated that confident relationships could be forged between states in different situations, so as to clarify their education problems and work out a certain number of guidelines - guidelines that prove more similar than might have been thought at the outset.

This dialogue is one aspect of the European dimension on your agenda. The richness of this dialogue is proof that Europe's unity may only be conceived in the diversity of identities, historic heritages, cultures and experiences.

That is why our co-operation has tackled not only technical problems but also common political choices.

Tomorrow, education will have to meet new challenges, more urgent than before: the growing rate of economic and technological change, the globalisation and transformation of production processes and the distribution of goods and services, a decline in traditional economic activities and the appearance of new types of activity, the increased mobility of people and ideas, the unprecedented development of worldwide media. A recent conference in Prague examined the impact of new technologies on science, art and communications.

The consequences of these phenomena may be positive and create the conditions for renewed vitality, such as Europe has already demonstrated at other moments of its history.

But we should not ignore the fact that not only is it possible to stray from the course but there are again signs of this in today's European society: a tendency to be inward-looking, aggressively nationalistic, intolerant, xenophobic, anti-Semitic, racist, mistrustful of a political world accused of an inability to find appropriate solutions. There has been a resurgence of irrationality and "back-to-nature" and "back-to-instinct" movements wrapped in a "pseudo-scientific" disguise, applied to disciplines such as ethology and sociobiology. These theories have been practised in a terrifying way in former Yugoslavia.

Beyond the dialogue on the structures and reforms of education systems, I think it is important that the project should also have focused on defining the European dimension in curricula and school life. I do not think that the European dimension should form a separate subject even though it may generate specific knowledge (such as European institutions and legislation). But, rather, it should be a state of mind to be developed through existing disciplines: a multiplicity of points of view, taking into account different conceptions in a spirit of tolerance and respect for their diversity, a sense of judgment and personal inquiry, a sense of dialogue and active citizenship.

The findings of our project demonstrate very pragmatically that this can be done, gradually, in syllabuses and in life, inside school and outside.

Educational co-operation, as promoted by the Council of Europe, is a process, admittedly a cautious one, attached as we are to the respect of differences between our countries, but a process nonetheless - one that is also the expression of a relentless desire. After all, educational co-operation is a pressing need in the context of the shared values that form our heritage, our past, and our hope for the future. After the ordeal of the cold war, this is how we can form or reform a European cultural identity based on our history, of course, but also and above all on the desire of men and women who want to find their roots and their reasons for hope in it. This cultural identity, to paraphrase Edgar Morin, will always be a freshly painted picture that will never dry.

Now that we are preparing for the second Summit of Heads of State and Government, one of whose aims will be to reach a decision about the Council of Europe's role in the new architecture of the continent, your conclusions will assume extra-special importance.

As Claude Lévi-Strauss wrote, the discovery of otherness is a matter of relationships, not of barriers.

Is not the primary task of our education systems to build bridges across the barriers which have separated people in the past?

I know that it is in this spirit that you are taking part in this meeting, and I hope that this conference will be rich in dialogue and pragmatic proposals for the future.

c. Address by M. Maitland Stobart, Deputy Director of Education, Culture and Sport and Head of the Education Division

For many of you, this Conference is your first contact with the Council of Europe. In my presentation, I will, therefore, set our Project, "A Secondary Education for Europe", in the general context of the programme of our Education Committee. The Education Committee is responsible for the Council of Europe's work on school and adult education, while tertiary education is dealt with by the Higher Education and Research Committee. This sister committee has just completed an ambitious project on access to higher education in Europe.

As a result of the far-reaching changes in Europe in the last seven years, the Council of Europe has become the widest intergovernmental and the widest interparliamentary forum in our continent. At present 44 States participate in our education programme, and they include 18 new partner countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Three or four more countries may join our programme in the coming months. We have, thus, become a pan-European organisation, and the region covered by our education programme stretches from Reykjavik to Berlin, Warsaw to Valadivostok, and from North Cape to Cyprus and Malta.

Furthermore, the USA and Canada have been granted observer status with the Council of Europe as a whole, and they may, if they wish, follow our activities on education. For its part, Israel has been given observer status with our Organisation's committees on education and culture.

Our Education Committee is convinced that the Council of Europe makes a specific and valuable contribution to European cooperation on education which is not provided by any other institution. This contribution reflects:

- the pan-European nature of the Council of Europe;
- its traditionally prominent role in European construction, in particular in education and culture;
- its commitment to human rights, democratic values and the rule of law;
- its concern for the individual and its refusal of situations of exclusion and marginalisation;
- its determination to strengthen mutual understanding and confidence between the peoples of Europe.

Whenever possible, we co-operate with:

- the other International Institutions - in particular UNESCO, the European Union, the Nordic Council of Ministers, and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). I am pleased to be able to inform you that we have joint activities with each of these institutions;
- INGOs, in particular international associations of young people, parents, teachers, researchers and administrators - several of which are represented at this Conference. NGOs are an essential element in any healthy civil society. They can provide institutions like the Council of Europe with valuable advice, and they can act as important relays for the dissemination of the results of our work.

It is common sense for international organisations to work together, to share expertise, and to establish joint activities. Not only will we avoid duplication of effort and wastage of scarce resources, we will also enrich each other's work because each organisation brings - to this co-operation - its own specific approaches, experiences, programmes and networks.

Programme priorities

Recently, the Education Committee has carried out a far-reaching review of its role and programme, and, in the next part of my presentation, I would like to describe briefly the Committee's main programme priorities for the Years 1997 - 2000.

The Committee's programme will contain a special element on education policies, which will reflect the Council of Europe's political objectives i.e. policies which:

- favour the development of the individual;
- promote democratic security and social cohesion;
- encourage greater personal mobility and exchanges.

In its work on education policies, the Committee will act as a pan-European forum for reflection and action, and it will not duplicate in any way the reviews of national educational policies which are carried out by the OECD. Our work may take the form of a hearing or a colloquy, and next year the Council of Europe and the European Commission will organise a joint colloquy on a topic which is identified as important and urgent by this Conference.

Between the Years 1997 - 2000, the Education Committee will also carry out three projects on education for democratic citizenship, on history teaching, and on modern languages. Each of these projects will last three years.

The project on education for democratic citizenship will cover both school and adult education. It will identify how formal and informal education can help young people and adults to acquire:

- the motivation, knowledge and skills to manage and improve our democratic institutions, uphold the rule of law and promote human rights;
- a set of values and attitudes, which includes tolerance, solidarity, compassion, respect for others, and civil courage.

The project on history will focus on the learning and teaching of the history of Europe from about 1900 to the present day in secondary schools. Its objectives are to:

- interest young people in secondary schools in the recent history of our continent and help them to understand the forces, movements, individuals and events that have shaped Europe in the 20th Century;
- provide policy-makers, curriculum developers and history teachers with practical advice and examples of innovatory approaches and good practice.

The project will deal both with positive mutual influences and with sensitive and controversial issues. It will also help young people to develop key skills of investigation, research and critical thinking, in particular the handling and analysis of written and audiovisual sources and the detection of bias, distortion and propaganda.

The new project on modern languages will be based on the conclusions and recommendations of the final conference of the present project, "Language Learning for European Citizenship", which will be held in Strasbourg from 15-18 April 1997. The project could culminate in a European Year of Languages in the Year 2001.

With the help of a group of member States, the Council of Europe has set up, in the Austrian City of Graz, a European Centre for Modern Languages. This Centre is intended to be a meeting place and a platform for policy-makers, specialists and multipliers from all over Europe. At present, because of the urgency of the situation, the Centre is paying special attention to the needs of our new partner countries in Central and Eastern Europe.

The European dimension of education

Between the Years 1997 - 2000, our Education Committee will continue to work in the European dimension of education through three very practical activities.

The first is the Europe at School Activity which is our main direct link with young people of school age. It is a joint activity of a group of member States, the Council of Europe and the European Union. It has played a pioneering role in promoting European awareness among school pupils, and also among their teachers and parents, for over 40 years. Last year, nearly one million pupils from some 30 countries took part in the Activity, and we hope that the number of young people and countries involved in the Activity will continue to grow.

The second activity is our Network on School Links and Exchanges, which concentrates on:

- the exchange of information and good practice, eg. "The Practical Guide to School Links and Exchanges in Europe";
- the pedagogy of school links and exchanges;
- the training of teachers involved in school in school links and exchanges and European projects between schools.

Alas, the Network does not have the resources to finance school links and exchanges.

The third activity is our In-Service Training Programme for Teachers. This Programme is the Education Committee's main link with the teaching profession, and, thanks to the bursaries available under the Programme, over 20,000 teachers have been able to attend a short in-service training course in another member State. About 1,000 bursaries will be available in 1997 for courses on such subjects as: exchanges; human rights education; intercultural education; history; heritage and environmental education; and school links and exchanges.

The Education Committee has made a special effort to encourage and support the reform of education in Central and Eastern Europe by:

- integrating its new partner countries successfully into all of its activities;
- carrying out special co-operation programmes in areas where the Committee has recognised expertise eg. the democratisation of education policies, the learning and teaching of modern languages, human rights education, and history teaching.

The Committee has also supported a Twinning Programme for Albanian Schools, and it is willing to contribute its experience and expertise to the reconstruction of the education systems in former Yugoslavia, in particular in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Last summer, the Education Committee - in co-operation with several American partners - organised seven training courses in Bosnia-Herzegovina, on human rights education and civics. They were attended by about 300 Bosnian teachers and trainers, and we intend to continue the initiative next summer together with our American partners and perhaps also with UNESCO.

The vital importance of dissemination

In conclusion, I would like to stress very forcefully the crucial importance of something which is usually mentioned only at the end of conferences. This is dissemination, and it is so vital that it must be in our minds in the coming days - and not just as a ritual message at the closing session.

Our project, "A Secondary Education for Europe", will have been in vain, even pointless, if its results are not used by our member States. But, to be used, they must first be known, and member States and the Secretariat have a shared responsibility to ensure that this is done as effectively as possible. The Secretariat will place the various studies and guides on the Internet, and we hope that, for their part, member States will:

- organise national and regional seminars on the results of the Project;
- translate and publish - in languages other than English and French, the two official languages of the Council of Europe - the most important studies and pedagogical material generated by the Project.

Finally, the conclusions of this Conference will be submitted to the next Session of our Standing Conference of the European Ministers of Education. The Session will be held in Kristiansand, Norway, from 22 - 24 June 1997, and we hope that the Ministers will take account of your conclusions and recommendations in their policies for secondary education.

1.3.2. Evaluation of the success of the project "A Secondary Education for Europe"

An evaluation of the success of the project was presented by **three speakers:**

- Evaluation of the project as a whole, by Pierre Luisoni
- Evaluation of the work on the general element (Guides to Secondary Education in Europe) by Denis Kallen
- Evaluation of the work on the specific element (European dimension), by Jean-Pierre Titz

The texts of these speeches can be found in Chapter 2 of this report.

1.3.3. First part of the group deliberations

The first sequence of group deliberations was introduced in a **speech by Gabor Halasz** (Hungary), which can be found in **Annex A**.

The six working groups then met separately, presided over by the following chairmen/rapporteurs: Group I: Mr Tveiten (Norway)/Mr Jackunas (Lithuania); Group II: Mr Breidling (Germany)/Mr Barthélemy (French Community of Belgium); Group III: Mr Bîrzea (Romania)/Mr Michielsens (Flemish Community of Belgium); Group IV: Mr Sakss (Latvia)/Mr Singh (United Kingdom); Group V: Mr Thum (Germany/Mr Hansen (Luxembourg); Group VI: Mr Janowski (Poland)/Mr Jourdan (Switzerland). Each rapporteur was assisted by a member of the DECS Secretariat.

The reports of the working groups were presented in a plenary session at the end of the second day of the conference.

1.3.4. Address by Mr Jaak Aaviksoo (Estonia)

Mr Aaviksoo told his audience, not without some humour, that although he had been invited some months ago in his capacity as Minister of Education of Estonia, he was now attending - such were the vagaries of politics - simply as a university lecturer and educator, as a father and also as a former pupil, which clearly qualified him to speak with some degree of freedom.

Mr Aaviksoo spoke first about Europe and the fundamental changes of recent years, which have given our continent new form. It was here, in Strasbourg, that Europe found its true meaning.

Of course, Europe stood for shared values but it also had a presence on the world market and would have a clear message and an identity to project to the rest of the world: democracy and human rights were the product of Europe, which must resolutely take up the torch.

For Mr Aaviksoo, education was still the best place to define what we had to "sell". If education was to be proud of itself and its history, it must also believe in its future, and its renewal depended on greater openness towards the rest of the world.

In the competitive world in which we live, schools were often criticised for not providing young people with sufficient skills to enable them to be competitive. It was principally to secondary education that we had to look, and if we took the words of the well-known song "What did you **learn** at school, son?" it became clear that simple answers, along the lines of "Never tell lies to Washington", were not enough. Equally important questions arose: "What did you **do** at school?" (I solved problems with the help of others) or "**How** did you learn?" (with the help of teachers who not only taught, but also loved, mathematics and children alike). Our ways of teaching originated in the nineteenth century, when there was little access to information, whereas nowadays it is rather a question of how to get rid of a surfeit of information and make choices!

People today need skills rather than knowledge. Through the ages it has been a question of man's relationship with objects; nowadays it is human relations which are important and that is another dimension. Survival and life do not only mean facing up to problems and solving them; today we have to anticipate, show a spirit of enterprise and the capacity to communicate and be capable of resolving conflict.

Too often it is forgotten that school is our "children's society", a complex environment where a great deal can be learned. What makes a good school is not necessarily brilliant teachers, equipment or laboratories, but the fact that it is able to create a climate where children can learn to socialise, fit in, talk and resolve conflict. All these skills are much more important than the formal subjects studied. So we need to strengthen the institution of the school and also to open it up because the world has changed and if schools are to perform well, they need to be in tune with their environment.

Another decisive element is new technology, which has to be given a more important role in education. Nowadays, "to get on in life, you have to keep up with developments" and with no training for this it will be increasingly difficult to find employment. We should also take care should to ensure that technology does not create further divisions or exclusions: the new technologies must not become the exclusive domain of privileged urban youth.

Mr Aaviksoo said that the schools of the future (schools which had yet to be created) ought to possess three fundamental characteristics: They should be equipped with modern technology, fit in well with their environment and be open to the "global village", and be capable of helping to resolve conflict.

Concluding, Mr Aaviksoo told his audience of the pleasure it had given him to read Denis Kallen's summary report which he felt was highly relevant. He also believed that "the principal challenge to secondary education is the quality of the education system" which has to involve "a re-examination of its structure and programmes. We will have to devise new structural solutions and create a new paradigm of education and culture in general"[1]

1.3.5. Second part of the group deliberations

The second sequence of group deliberations was introduced in a **speech by Jean-Michel Leclercq** (France), which can be found in **Annex B**.

---

[1] Kallen D., Summary of the report "Secondary education, an expedient concept" (DECS/SE/Sec(96)-45), p.12.

Group deliberations then took place in the usual way, with a pooling of findings in plenary session at the end of the third day of the conference.

1.3.6. Round Table on the European dimension

Led by Mr Domingos Fernandes, Director of the Department of Secondary Education in Portugal, the "round table" - or rather "panel" - which opened the final half-day of deliberations, was made up of the authors of the summary report on the European dimension.

In his introduction Mr Fernandes, a subject spec-ialist, recalled the importance his country had attached to the European dimension in education for several years; he also referred to a number of initiatives and experiments, such as the "European clubs", which had been the subject of a paper in the context of this project. Mr Fernandes' vision of the European dimension coincided remarkably with the ideas and proposals put forward during the project. To avoid repetition we will not therefore include them here, but the reader is referred to chapter 3.4 of this report.

Speaking about the education system, he recalled that it was "the mirror of what we are as a people and as a culture". Although the idea of a "European school" seemed to be pure Utopia it was, nevertheless, important "to build a European idea together and a wide range of joint projects was available to schools". The priority principles were education for all where everyone counts - minorities, in particular - and "reasonable and critical" training for citizenship.

With regard to the results of the project, Mr Fernandes emphasised the benefits of "products" as a base from which to start and at the same time a challenge to greater commitment. He stressed the importance of the epistemological and pedagogic debate which would foster "working with" rather than "for". He also mentioned the present trend of education systems highlighting the value of basic knowledge; although a legitimate concern, there is a danger that this could lead to neglecting the need to "equip young people" with tools such as a critical mind, the ability to resolve conflict and the initiative to launch projects. In conclusion, Mr Fernandes said that the European dimension ought to be seen both as an added value in terms of what schools did and as a balance between a fully outward-looking attitude and the protection of national and local heritage.

During the discussion which followed, the authors of the summary report were in turn invited to recall the essential points of their views with regard to the concept itself, the training of teachers, pedagogical measures and the dissemination of the results of the project. (see chapter 3.4.).

A number of delegates then took the floor:

- to highlight the importance of the work carried out in the Council of Europe - a preferred meeting place - on the European dimension and to express the wish for extensive publicity and continued cooperation,
- to insist on the appropriateness of the pragmatic and practical approach developed in the project and to express the wish that any measures taken should take account of all pupils,

- to draw attention to the difficulties encountered in some countries (as a result of an unfavourable economic situation or the distressing consequences of their history) to convince the key players in the education system of the importance of the European dimension,

- finally, to express the wish that the term "European dimension" of education did, indeed, imply the concept of a "European presence" in education.

1.3.7. General report

The general rapporteur Pierre Luisoni, gave a preliminary, verbal, outline of his report, of which a fuller, more complete version can be found in the final written form. This constitutes **Chapter 3 of this document**, and is entitled "Summary of the discussions at the final conference".

Concluding, the general rapporteur also heartily thanked all those who had been involved and made a positive contribution to the success of the final conference: the participants themselves, the chairmen and rapporteurs of the working groups, the experts who had introduced themes, coordinators and members of the Project Group, members of the Secretariat who had assisted the group rapporteurs, Jean-Pierre Titz and his team and, in particular, Lisa Cittone who had "orchestrated" the whole event so well.

1.3.8. Bringing the conference to a close

The work of the conference was brought to a final close by Raymond Weber, Director of Education, Culture and Sport, who began by thanking the general rapporteur for his presentation. The project on secondary education was, he said, a truly great project, rich in content, having produced a large number of documents, and valuable, too, for the reflection it had fostered in Europe. The idea that the renewal of education systems is a continuing process ought to inspire us not to rest on our laurels, but to continue our reflection with even greater focus on the future.

Since its foundation, the Council of Europe has made a great contribution to intercultural affairs, the arts, history, languages and citizenship; clearly these subjects are worthy of further reflection, but new challenges are coming to the fore and these, according to Mr Weber, ought to occupy our thoughts in the future. First, there are the new technologies of information and communication, not merely for themselves, but for their relationship with education. We will have to find a "new pedagogical language" if we are to prepare minds for the change which seems to have become a permanent feature in our lives, to cope with the obsolescence of knowledge, to question the purpose of change, the use of technology and its integration, which ought to seek to be effective and equitable. The second theme concerns work and the place of the market economy in people's lives. For many years, full-time employment and the qualifications which gave access to it were the cornerstone of an active society and the main goal of education. Things have changed: unemployment and job insecurity mean that the relationship between human beings and work needs to be rethought and that young people need to be prepared for an active life in spite of job uncertainties in the future.

Concluding, Mr Weber mentioned the value of intergovernmental cooperation within the Council of Europe. It does not seek the lowest common denominator or woolly consensus but rather, through shared experience, opens the way to finding a response, even though that response may be only partial or provisional. The Council of Europe can achieve a lot and, at the same time, little; a lot, by means of the network of experts which is its real strength; little, because the Council of Europe is not the Secretariat, but the Member States themselves; and on their shoulders rests the dynamism of activities and their impact.

Finally, before thanking all those involved in the conference - participants, experts and members of the Secretariat - and bringing the conference to a close, Raymond Weber drew attention to two important dates for the Council of Europe in 1997: the Conference of Ministers of Education in Kristiansand in June and the Summit of Heads of State and of Government of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg in October.

II. ASSESSMENT

2.1. **Overall assessment**, by Pierre Luisoni, Chairman of the Project Group.

"For me, the image of this conference which springs to mind is a musical one:

- a fermata, as at the end of an important work: bringing something to its conclusion...
- a fermata, as within a Bach chorale: a punctuation mark, rather than a full stop: one musical phrase has come to an end, but another will follow...
- and finally, a fermata because these are usually placed, not over a single note, but over a chord...

A final conference marks:

- the end of a project,
- the beginning of a "post project period",
- the time for summing up: What do we, in Europe, agree upon with regard to secondary education?

As Chairman of the Project Group, it is my task this morning to make a preliminary assessment of what has been achieved: I have to take account of the positive and the negative and somehow identify the achievements of these six years of work.

The document you have received which was prepared by the Secretariat [DECS/SE/Sec(96)34] contains a number of informative elements (see **Annex C**), so I will not go into any detail. I will also leave it to Denis Kallen and Jean-Pierre Titz to give a presentation of the work carried out within the context of the general element and the specific element.

For my part, let me simply:

- recall the origins of the project, the aims it set itself and the results achieved, not only in terms of "products" but also in terms of "processes";
- highlight some of the characteristics of the project and some of its weaknesses;
- finally, refer to the "post-project period" and conclude with some brief thoughts on our final conference.

Origins of the project

The idea came into being at a difficult time, when the Council of Europe was debating its future and the CDCC was being restructured and concentrating its programme; a time, too, when democracy was being installed in central and eastern Europe. The overall climate was, it has to be said, rather morose and full of uncertainty.

It was at that time that the idea was mooted for a great mobilising project, ambitious, substantial, responding to the needs of Member States; an innovative project too in the results it was expected to produce, which could draw on - and hope to develop - the experience of the Council of Europe, its competence to consider matters relating to education, its flexible and varied working methods and, finally, taking advantage of its recognised strength - an excellent network of experts. In terms of a theme this, too, was virtually pre-ordained: an important project on innovation in primary education had just come to an end. However, this was not the main reason: it was quite clear that there was a need for extensive reflection on the subject of secondary education on a European level and with a European perspective.

Initial objectives and results

As you know, results can only be achieved in relation to the objectives set. I will therefore very briefly recall the framework determined for the project at the first symposium held in Brussels in 1990, along with the general and operational objectives:

General framework:

- a single project;
- two elements, one on the problems of secondary education in Europe and the other, more specific, on taking account of the European dimension in secondary education;
- two successive approaches, for each of the two elements: the gathering and analysis of information and the summarisation of trends and prospects.

Objectives and activities, general element

- to meet a critical need for information by gathering systematic and precise data on the organisation of education systems in Europe and responding to the need to find common solutions to give Europe the secondary education it needs.

- Vital points: objectives, curricula, content and methods, evaluation, diplomas, teacher training.

Objectives and activities, specific element

- Document experience (case studies) and disseminate it (collection of monographs).
- Evaluate different experiences and, if possible, use this information to draw up guidelines and a teaching guide.
- Establish a sort of "threshold level" for the European dimension in history/geography/social education.
- Seek ways of introducing the European dimension into other disciplines.
- Propose thematic approaches on significant issues such as the environment, health, a multicultural society, human rights, etc., leading to the implementation of joint projects.
- Publish a European dimension atlas.
- Make every endeavour to foster exchanges.

Implementation

- Undertake concrete activities which meet the needs of Member States and also for the construction of Europe.
- Secure close links with other activities taking place in the Council of Europe.
- Collaborate closely with other governmental or non-governmental organisations.
- Pay particular attention to cooperation with the countries of central and eastern Europe.

Six years on the **results** are, as you can see for yourselves, rather impressive (see the document referred to in Annex C).

- **For the general element:**

- 10 symposia were organised (3 in central and eastern Europe), thanks to the generosity of Member States, to whom at this point we should express our appreciation; each symposium was the subject of a report, many of which were of the highest quality, (not to mention the studies which were produced for their preparation);
- 23 national guides published; 13 others exist in final manuscript form, plus a number which are still provisional: in all, an almost complete panorama of education systems in Europe at secondary level;

- an equally impressive summary report, penned by Denis Kallen, coordinator of the work overall.

- **For the specific element:**

- a summary report on the European dimension, with four authors, also of very high quality;
- 15 thematic pedagogical dossiers, ten of which are currently available in a basic form (problems with the publishers), coordinated by Raymond Ryba;
- 12 monographs setting out "good practice", specific and successful experiments introducing the European dimension in teaching;
- 6 monographs designed to encourage teachers to give greater thought to the issue;
- the creation of a network of exchange coordinators (6 meetings) which has proved to be useful and effective;
- an extremely rich and useful vade-mecum on exchanges which is currently being updated; a liaison bulletin;
- a framework (modules) for training teachers for links/exchanges, which is to be published soon;
- finally, within the context of the CDCC programme for continuing training for teachers (bursaries), 24 seminars were organised on theses associated with the secondary project.

In terms of **products**, the project has generated a real goldmine. And I think I can say - but you, too, are here to give your opinion on this - that this enormous "production" is, moreover, of very high quality (intellectual, pedagogical and didactic).

So it is with some pride that as Chairman of the Project Group I think I can state: we have achieved our objectives, for the most part; any which have not yet been achieved, no doubt will have been, thanks to you, by the end of this conference; any which have not been achieved were, perhaps, too ambitious, taking into consideration the constraints of enlargement and the very limited human and financial resources.

There is, however, one factor I would like to stress in this evaluation and that is the **"process"** aspect of this project, three elements of which I would like to highlight:

- **several hundred people** (administrators, experts, teachers) have been involved, whether it be in symposia/seminars, the exchange network or the Donaueschingen seminars. Each one of these people has experienced and learned **dialogue**, the **comparison of ideas** and **joint discussion**. This personal development cannot be measured but is, perhaps, the most beneficial aspect in the long term, because I am convinced that it enriches each individual, and even his everyday work.

- through this project a **real pan-European forum** has been established, an enormous network which has been woven around secondary education. Clearly, the extraordinary enlargement of the Council of Europe in so short a time (we numbered 27 in the beginning; now we are 44) made the project more cumbersome and complicated. However enlargement has enriched the debate, whether in eastern, central or western Europe. So Mr J.-M. Leclercq, whose words I am taking the liberty of quoting, is able to refer to "*a deep understanding that came to be established between the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and those of Western Europe, in spite of the distances seemingly separating them with regard to what they expect of the democratisation of education or the assessments that can be made of it*".[2] Between what might seem to be an absolute lack of realism and deceptive pragmatism "*both sides quite plainly saw that they were following the same line of thinking and action even though, for reasons of circumstance, they found themselves bunched together at either end of that line*"[3]. So there was the realisation that education in the countries of central and eastern Europe and in the west was experiencing very similar problems and that any differences were more of degree than of nature. It was also very soon established that a common heritage of shared values existed: a multiplicity of opinions and the respect for individual freedom in a democratic society. The risk of a kind of two-speed (East/West) project which had been raised at the beginning of activities was therefore quickly rejected; a number of activities were implemented specifically for the countries of central and eastern Europe (seminars on legislation and reform), but what needs to be stressed in particular is that the new democracies very soon became fully and very actively involved in the whole project which then quite naturally became pan-European in nature;

  and finally, the process of setting up and pursuing the study in even greater detail of **education and education systems and their association with values, democracy, pluralism, intercultural affairs, human rights, the value of the individual and his place in society and the construction of a more united and more fraternal Europe**. We are a long way from short-sighted utilitarianism and blissful spiritualism: that is an ideal. At this point I really must stress the specific and irreplaceable role which the Council of Europe plays and must play in this matter: defending and, in particular, developing and increasing our common educational heritage in Europe.

I think that in terms of process, too, the results are positive.

Other positive characteristics

There are a number of other points I could highlight in this evaluation:

- the coherence of the project: all possible synergies within the Council of Europe itself have been established around the theme;

---

[2] Leclercq, J-M., Report on the symposium held at Bialobrzegi (Poland) on "Democratisation and reform of secondary education in central and eastern Europe" (November 1992), Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1993, p.12.

[3] ibidem.

- the originality of the project, both in terms of working methods (a whole panoply was deployed: symposium/seminars/case studies/expert papers); the originality of the results: the Council of Europe rarely involves itself in producing pedagogical and didactic tools; we calculated the advantages, but also the difficulties and the limits; the originality of the form the project took: modern and attractive (quite a revolution on the design of Council of Europe publications!); the originality of the joint action which unites all those involved, "ministries of the classroom" ...

- its complementarity with the work of other organisations: I am thinking here in particular of exchanges with the European Union (COMENIUS Programme), and also the OECD's VOTEC project or UNESCO's UNEVOC project.

Weaknesses

In terms of the project's **weaknesses** (which are, incidentally, relative), I would mention:

- its duration (some data are, of course, already out of date). But this long duration was imposed on you by both the enlargement and constraints on human and financial resources;

- the limited space devoted to vocational education. However this, too, was intentional, so as to avoid duplication with the OECD (VOTEC) and UNESCO (UNEVOC).

- the limited space devoted to innovation. Here, too, the choice of working method itself imposed a choice and in any event it is not certain, as D Kallen stresses in his summary report, that innovation is a decisive factor in the secondary sector. This conference will provide an opportunity to confirm or negate that observation.

The post-project period

Now we come to the **post-project period**:

- there will be a very important initial **political meeting**: the 19th Conference of European Ministers of Education in Kristiansand. There ministers will study the results of the project: this will tie up all the loose ends, and it is hoped that national policies will then see the advantages ...

- in the post-project period, there will also be a phase which is of vital importance: **dissemination**, in every imaginable way. Just now, Mr Stobart laid great emphasis on this, and with good reason. We will return to this in our report at the end of the conference, but I would like to stress it at this point, too:

- the distribution of publications, the idea being to have a number of distribution centres in each country;

- translation, we hope, into languages other that French and English;

- the Internet;

- national seminars: these are the most effective kind and we are counting on **your** involvement;

- finally, in the post-project period, it will be necessary to plan follow-up and development activities. The summary reports (European dimension) refer to these; it is up to you, at this conference, to say what would be necessary and desirable and in what form, it being understood that the project will not organise itself ...

Acknowledgements

Before I finish, I have a number of acknowledgements to make:

- to Member States which hosted symposia and seminars: without this type of voluntary involvement, a project of this nature would never have been possible;

- to our two coordinators, D Kallen and R Ryba, who were faced with a colossal task and have acquitted themselves admirably;

- to all the experts who have so enriched our discussions;

- to the Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport (Mr Stobart) and his secretariat in particular (J-P Titz, Lisa Cittone, Robert Blackwell, Anne Brunellière). D Kallen says of them: "their skill and devotion have far surpassed what could have reasonably been expected of them". I, for my part, share these sentiments: not only has the Secretariat played its administrative role but its intellectual input terms of comments and proposals has been considerable.

- finally, I would like to thank my colleagues in the Project Group, whose commitment throughout our 6 meetings has been unfailing.

Conclusion

Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think I can say, in conclusion, that the project on secondary education has been a good project. It was a "big" project, a rather crazy project, too, which mobilised a lot of good will and substantial financial resources - but everything is relative - and which has produced tangible, concrete and interesting results. Once again, the Council of Europe has played its own inimitable role: conservatoire, observatory, laboratory and, we hope, leading light.

So there we are. We have three and a half days together here to continue our discussion, evaluation and proposals, but our main aim should be to identify the most rewarding, significant and fundamental aspects and those which are most likely to influence educational policy in our countries where it concerns secondary education. There is, however, one thought to bear in mind: "A Secondary Education **for** Europe": we are talking about young Europeans (not merely the nationals of our own countries); what needs to be at the very heart of our preoccupations is the European educational area - more comparable, more coherent - which needs to be constructed and developed. I ask you to bear this in mind throughout the coming days, which I hope will be rewarding, interesting and productive."

2.2. Evaluation of the work of the general element, by Denis Kallen, General Co-ordinator of the secondary Education guide within Europe

May I start my remarks, Mr President, with what could be interpreted as a disclaimer:

In the next few minutes I will highlight some of the issues that are treated in more detail in the voluminous report that you have in front of you. The report has generously drawn upon the 35 Country Reports that were until now available, but it also contains a part of personal appreciation and judgment.

As everybody faced with such a task, I had to come to grips with two not easily reconcilable facts: the enormous diversity of secondary education in Europe, increased and, I would say, enriched by the "return to Europe" of the Central and Eastern European countries and, on the other hand, the fact that all these countries and systems have very much in common, if only due to a shared historical past and to having to face the same economic and social challenges, albeit in different time-perspectives.

In my report I have tried to give their due share to the common and to the differences, but the common features have perhaps here and there been stressed to the detriment of the differences. The many quotations in the report fulfil in this context two purposes: they re-establish to some extent the balance, while on the other hand they represent examples of good - and occasionally less good - practice.

1. Allow me to first underline what seems to me to be one of the major paradoxes that schools and educational systems are facing nowadays:

- they are under heavy attack on account of their presumed poor adaptation to the needs of society, often also of presumed falling standards and of a lacking quality of the services that they provide. At the same time, the faculty of the public sector and of central administration to assure an adequate and high-quality educational provision is put into doubt

- but at the same time, the trust in the State as the supreme warrant of the educational service has on the whole remained intact and the faith in the social and individual benefits of education remained.

Education has always had to live with such paradoxes, with paradoxical expectations. They are inherent to the fact that it serves many interests and many masters.

1.1 Two facts corroborate this assumption of an unabated faith in education:

i. the levels of resourcing have remained high, even if their growth has stagnated. Moreover, the gap between countries with high and with low-spending levels is gradually shrinking; it will be interesting to see what will happen to financing levels once the effects of the demographic decline have attained their full reach;

ii. the values and principles that are associated with liberal thinking and free markets and the related notions of competition and narrowly conceived efficiency have until now affected secondary education only very marginally inasfaras its fundamental aims and purposes are concerned - and at any rate much less so than higher education. With a few minor exceptions the balance between the public sector and private initiative has not significantly changed.

1.2 However, the schools have, often under political pressure, started to integrate some of these liberal values in their internal functioning: terms such as "efficiency" and "client-centredness" have become part of the educational vocabulary; the relationship of the school with parents and pupils has become that of a provider of educational services with its clients. Their demands have become one of the main determinants of the nature of the curriculum provision.

In the longer run, these trends could weaken the position of the professionals, that is of teachers and heads, and strengthen of that of the community, or, to use a fashionable word, of the "stakeholders", that is parents, pupils and the representatives of the local social and economics interests.

2. Allow me after these introductory remarks to mention two major conclusions from the Project on the development of secondary education:

i. first, enrolments up to age 17 to 19 are, with a few exceptions in Central/Eastern and Southern Europe, rapidly becoming "universal". The increased participation is due to the difficulties that secondary school leavers, even those with a professional qualification, experience in finding work; to the related increased demand for post-secondary education and also to the effect to the to the demographic decline on the demand for more and higher education. Another, often overseen role is laid by the pressure on the secondary schools to fully utilise their available capacity and eventually to lower their criteria for admission.

ii. whereas the past decades have seen only relatively minor adjustments, major structural and curriculum changes seem now to impose themselves, contrary to what was expected until very recently.

These changes will centre on upper secondary education, that is on the short span of years - between 2 and 4 according to countries - between the completion of compulsory schooling and higher education or access to employment. The articulation between compulsory schooling and upper secondary has in his connection in many countries came under pressure and it may need to be thoroughly re-structured.

3. Lower secondary or upper basic education had taken many years to attain its present, apparently definitive structure, marked by the co-existence of comprehensive and selective systems.

The turbulent and often uncontrolled developments in Central/Eastern Europe have led to a breach in this *status quo*: besides the common basic school, private, but also public selective gymnasia have re-appeared. They drain many of the best pupils from the common schools and they may thus in many communities become a threat to its quality and even to its sheer survival.

On the other hand, the sharp edges of the difference between comprehensive and selective systems have gradually been smoothened and their potential in view of equity of the educational provision is probably less different than in the past.

4. Upper secondary education is confronted with a rapid change in its functions that cannot leave its structure untouched.

Its terminal function is rapidly eroded to the benefit of its transitional function, that is of preparing for post-secondary or higher education. The most developed countries may soon be faced with a situation where all secondary school leavers, if they wish to find, sooner of later, a place on the labour market, will have to enrol in some post-secondary programme and where all professional training in the proper sense of the word will have disappeared from secondary education.

One is entitled to doubt whether higher education will be up to the enormous challenge that this represents, whereas at the same time, the labour market, the enterprises, public and private, are unlikely to increase or even to maintain their provisions for post-secondary training.

This prospect challenges the legitimacy of the structural division of upper secondary education between general and technical programmes. On the other hand, the shorter vocational programmes risk to become marginalised and many of them may be discontinued. In countries with a strong tradition and a strong position of post-compulsory vocational training, this development may take place at a slower pace. But the odds are that also there, professional training will gradually move up to the post-secondary stage, if it is only because of the growing level of general education that is required of the prospective students.

On the other hand, upper secondary education comes under increasing pressure to diversify and enrich its curriculum provision, in response to the needs of a more diversified pupil population.

These developments will have two implications:

i. the structural division between general and technical-vocational programmes will gradually make place for comprehensive models that offer the full range of curricula and that allow easy transfer between programmes. The demographic decline will further strengthen this development, as it will enforce school mergers that will bring general and technical/vocational programmes under one roof;

ii. all programmes will grant to their graduates eligibility to higher education and the difference between types of eligibility - to university or to non-university programmes - will become less marked, if it were only because of the growing equivalence of all upper secondary education in terms of general education.

It may be that this will also lead to challenging the legitimacy of the straightjacket of the age-grade system and of full-time and multi-year programme. Perhaps an all-age secondary school that offers a wide range of full - and part-time courses and that offers - such as the Open Universities - individual courses as well as degree programmes, would be the most appropriate answer to these future challenges.

5. Decentralisation and school autonomy have become major catchwords in the present educational discussion. They sometimes even to be seen as the panacea to all educational problems.

For the time being, however, reality is in many countries still far remote from the proclaimed policy intentions. But we may in this matter only be at the beginning of a long process, the final outcome of which is still largely unknown. Decentralisation and school autonomy may represent the most radical educational change of our times. At present however, much is still undecided and there is much insecurity and confusion as to the precise re-distribution of responsibilities between the different levels. Among these, the so-called "intermediate" one - regional or local - is in many countries the least well defined and its sheer legitimacy and usefulness are often put into doubt.

Of the many questions that in this respect beg for an answer, I will mention the following:

i. decentralisation and autonomy have many legitimations. Some of them are hidden and unadmitted. Others are difficult to reconcile. The economic efficiency target is difficult to reconcile with that of a greater diversity of curriculum provision and with the need for a close interaction with the local community - and this particularly in times of demographic decline and budgetary restriction. Social divisions are, on the other hand, much more pronounced and effective at the local than at the national level. The equity of the educational provision may thus in many cases be threatened.

ii. the problem of the nature of the cultural identity of regions and local communities in times of a global technological culture. Even if one accepts the idea that this global culture is compatible with national cultural sovereignty and with a diversity of local cultural discourses, it is difficult to conceive how these local variant can survive. Besides, in large parts of Europe physical mobility has totally disrupted whatever remained of traditional local identity. It seems very difficult to re-construct such an identity on a totally new basis. Commuter communities are a case in point.

iii. this has an immediate bearing upon the possible nature of the regional, local and school dimension of the curricula. Until now, they are often not more than simple extensions of the national curricula and in those cases where they have a specific local legitimation, they occupy a low place on the academic ranking scale;

iv. the allocation of responsibilities to the various levels - regional, local, school - represents a complex puzzle. The required professional competence is probably highest at the school level, whereas the power may mainly rest at the regional or local level. Here lies a source of potential conflict.

Close monitoring seems advisable of the further development of decentralisation ad autonomy and of their translation into curriculum provisions and in participatory decision-making involving all partners, at the national scale first, but perhaps also in a comparative international perspective.

6. The coming into being of the autonomous school does not everywhere follow a smooth course. I already mentioned the distrust of many educators *vis-à-vis* the inherent principle of the school run as an enterprise, in competition for pupils and or the quality of its outcomes with other schools on a free market.

But there are also, less profound, but equally real obstacles. The required investment in time on behalf of all involved partners is one of them. It appears difficult to mobilise parents and representatives of the social and economic community. School councils often are dominated by the professionals, that is the teachers and school's governors or representatives of local administration - for lack of commitment of the other parties. The participation of pupils is only very slowly coming into being.

The report puts forward the notion of the school as a community in its own right, with its own behavioural codes, its own network of social relations - a concept that is fully ignored in most policy documents but that has a real meaning for those who spend during many years a great deal of their time in this community. It is submitted that the recognition of this reality could do much to dissipate many misunderstandings as to the staff's pedagogical functions and as to the relationships with parents.

7. Besides decentralisation and school autonomy, the second catchword on the present day educational scene is evaluation. Its heightened importance has several justifications. Among them, the delegation of responsibilities to the schools is primordial. But also greater curriculum diversity and a widespread trend in modern societies to demand measured and comparable results in exchange for the resources that society has invested. In education, scientific evaluation also often compensates for the lesser control that the Inspectorate now often exercises over schools and teachers.

Externally imposed evaluation along criteria defined elsewhere obviously sets limits to the freedom of local communities and schools. Their margin for determining their own policies has at any rate always been restricted, but these restrictions have now been formulated in precise and constringent terms and they are in spite of an otherwise enlarged autonomy, often experienced as obstacles to setting one's own, institutional objectives: national or core curricula, detailed rules as to resource allocation and spending, strict regulations concerning the recruitment, working conditions and salaries of staff, limit in fact considerably the newly granted freedom to set one's own course.

External evaluation is in this context a sensitive issue if any. It is generally agreed that the evaluation of schools and teachers should be surrounded with great precautions and that one should be extremely careful in linking its outcomes to promotion, resource allocation and the like. On the other hand, scientifically valid and socially acceptable formula often still have to be found.

The answer to the quandary of many parties concerned with school and staff evaluation lies in a judicious mixture of internal or self evaluation and external evaluation. If schools and teachers are not enabled to thus appropriate themselves their share of the overall evaluation process, evaluation risks to backfire and do more harm than good to the relevance and qualify of education. It is everywhere recognised that it must in the first place serve to assess the quality of the implementation of the school's own development plan and to help teachers to improve their teaching and only in the second place the undisputable needs of national and local administrations. It is equally widely agreed that there keeps being a need for an external element in the overall evaluation process. In his connection, the role of the Inspectorate needs in many countries to be fully re-defined.

8. I will not dwell upon the great progress that national or core curricula represent in terms of determining the precise responsibilities of the centre and the periphery for curriculum provision. They must leave sufficient room for local and school curricula - but they do so to very varying extents.

It is a matter of discussion, whether they should go together with mandatory achievement measurement or not. For the time being, most countries concerned have for political reasons decided against.

On the other hand, it is rather generally acknowledged that there is a need for nationally - and to an extent internationally comparable - achievement measurement in any educational system and a fortiori in a decentralised one. In many Central and Eastern Europe this is a sensitive and urgent issue that requires clear and rapid answers.

That the interpretation and even more so the exploitation of the outcomes of such assessment needs to be surrounded with great precaution, needs hardly to be said. Similar precautions need to be taken in using educational indicators, however well they are elaborated scientifically, for purposes of educational policy and practice.

9. Human resource development is the term that perhaps best renders the growing awareness that school heads, teachers and other school staff must be given the opportunity not only to update their knowledge and competencies, but that they must also be offered career and promotion perspectives. In times of stagnating pupil numbers, of rarefaction of recruitment of new teachers and of an ageing staff this may seem illusory. But it is apart from equity reasons one of the few ways to handle the widespread fatigue and demotivation in the teaching force.

In the new constellation of school autonomy, this task befalls primarily upon the schools and their principals themselves. But it cannot be carried out satisfactorily if local and national administrations do not participate and make extra resources available (of which early retirement plans may be part).

The report shows enormous discrepancies in teacher salaries and abysmally low salaries in most of Central and Eastern Europe. It must, however, be recognised that several of them have recently made great efforts to improve teacher remunerations.

There is also ample evidence of the difficulties that are widely experienced in making in-service training work, often due to inadequate replacement provisions, but also to other, more substantival reasons.

On the other hand, the pedagogical pre-service training of a great deal of the secondary teachers remains one of the main weak spots in the system. This is an issue that to my mind should be taken up with the universities in a no-bounds discussion.

10. It would be pretentious on my behalf to treat the complex issue of the performance of secondary education in Europe in a few sentences. Therefore only a few points that touch upon the systems' performance, but do not express a value judgement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

First what may seem to a rather trivial statement: the secondary schools have in a rather short span of time doubled or trebled their pupil numbers, certainly sometimes under precarious conditions, but the enormous problems of provisional school buildings, heavily overcrowded classes and double or treble shift teaching have in most cases now been solved, but not everywhere.

Secondly, the enormous growth in pupil numbers has in all likehood not led to a decline in quality, to lower average achievement. On the contrary, the percentage of the age-group that leaves secondary education with a general or professional certificate has been multiplied.

Teacher-pupil ratios and class sizes have on the whole, after a deterioration in the past times of rapid enrolment growth, in most countries gradually improved.

Whether secondary education offers a greater equality of educational opportunity nowadays than it used to is difficult to say. Participation in terms of social origin, of ethnic belonging, of gender, remains unequal, but the inequalities have become more subtle. On the whole they now concern participation in different curricula, inequality in success and completion rates, in transfer rates to higher education or in access to employement, and not anymore in overall participation.

By the sametoken, it has become more difficult to detect them and to reduce them. On the other hand, no satisfactory solutions have been found concerning the admittedly relatively small group of pupils who leave school at the completion or before the completion of compulsory schooling.

Two major problems have, however, arisen as far as the two "outlets" for secondary graduates are concerned, i.e. the labour market and higher education. The number of places in both institutions falls in most countries far short of the number of candidates. It would be unfair to blame secondary education in this matter. It responds to a real demand and the increased and better education that the young generation now receives will in the long run be to the benefit of our societies.

Allow me to conclude with a statement that appears at the beginning of the Synthesis report: "Secondary education is more than ever at the heart of the educational exterprise" and the quality of the entire educational construction depends on the quality of the secondary education service.

2.3. Evaluation of the work of the specific element by Jean-Pierre Titz, Project leader at the DECS Secretariat

Mr Chairman, I would like to apologise for the absence of Raymond Ryba, coordinator of our work on the European dimension. Anyone who knows Raymond will know that he is someone who always meets his commitments. I have had the privilege of working with him throughout the project, in particular on the part concerning the European dimension and I can assure you that if he is not here with us today, it is not without good reason.
He has done me the honour of asking me to replace him, and although clearly I cannot do that, I will do my best to explain the work we have undertaken with Raymond Ryba and the other experts who worked on the European dimension.

1. Approach

When we started up this project, it had been sanctioned in a number of quarters. First, it had a dual political legitimacy: in 1989 the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe had adopted a recommendation on the introduction of the European dimension in schools, and in Vienna in 1991 the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education adopted an extremely clear and attractive resolution on the same subject.

However, in addition to these political exhortations there were also less formal demands coming from teachers, inspectors and teacher trainers, increasingly convinced of the need to introduce a European dimension, but calling for practical ways of doing it. It very soon became apparent that this was much more difficult than had at first been thought. From the very start we had to steer a course between two dangerous obstacles.

The first was banality. Many teachers of languages, both ancient and modern, along with teachers of religious education, history, literature, etc. thought that in teaching these disciplines they were automatically introducing a European dimension into the classes by the very nature of their subject. Of course geography, literature, philosophy, languages, history, etc. are all part of the European dimension. But to leave it there would be to "make the European dimension" just as M. Jourdan made prose ... unwit-tingly.

The second danger was dogmatism, that is to say a naive approach, unacceptable both politically and culturally, which consisted of saying "Our curricula were all conceived in the context of those great national education systems which, in the majority of our countries, were constructed in the 19th century in the context of the nation state. This is now Europe's moment, we can sweep aside all that, and in the place of the history or philosophy ... of one country or another, we are going to introduce an official European history, an official European literature ..." In the context of cultural cooperation and the Council of Europe, this approach could not be upheld, particularly as numerous attempts undertaken by different authors have indicated that it will lead nowhere.

It became clear that the way forward was not to find a middle course between these two dangers, but rather to try a different approach.

We opted for an essentially pragmatic approach. We decided not to try *a priori* to define the European dimension, as this could mean an endless succession of symposia. Each one of here today has his own, legitimate, way of defining the European dimension. Instead, we tried to take a much more empirical attitude, which consisted of saying: "In this project let us consider as involving the European dimension anything that each Member State calls or claims to be the European dimension". We therefore tried to analyse what was called the European dimension in class and in schools, etc. In this way, as Mr Luisoni said, we came across a goldmine.

2. Practical steps

On the one hand, in terms of programmes, content and actual disciplines, we found a great deal. We saw that considerable thought had already been given to the way in which the initiatives of teachers or headteachers, inspectors and others are trying, without disrupting official programmes, to introduce the European dimension, or in any event to start to give the matter some thought. Whenever we came across an interesting experiment or someone who had had an original thought in this respect we asked them to write a paper describing their actual experiences in class or examples of themes or subject matter highlighting the European dimension. This was merely a thought-provoking exercise, since such papers clearly have no legislative value, any more than any other of the documents we have produced. This part of the project was supported, as Mr Luisoni said, by seminars organised in the context of the programme of continuing training for teachers.

On the other hand, a second activity which developed quite unexpectedly, was school links and exchanges. Initially, it had been intended to organise a seminar on the subject, but it soon became apparent that there was such a growth of interest, both quantitative and qualitative, that it merited a wider approach, and this led to the setting up of the school links and exchanges network and to the forthcoming production of teaching materials on the training of teachers for exchanges. Consequently, the part of the project "School links and exchanges" became a project within the project and, as Mr Stobart said, one of the Education Committee's permanent activities.

And finally, the last activity. We decided that it was not enough simply to describe good practice, generating ideas of a general nature, and that we should take a risk and deal with content and methods. We took this risk with Mr Ryba. He very courageously agreed to this in 1991, because it was not the most obvious thing to do. We started off with an idea from the French Community of Belgium, which was to produce an atlas. We thought that producing a map was probably a good way of avoiding a very complicated debate on history or identities, or cultures. Translating that into a number of programmes is extremely complicated. As a result of the experience acquired with this atlas of the French Community of Belgium, we became aware that however good the formula was on a national level, to try to do the same thing on a European level was almost impossible because the variables to be taken into consideration became impossible to control. Maps, as you know, and as we had perhaps naively ignored at the outset, speak. They have a content, and they are not objective. There is no obvious way of representing the information selected. In addition, there is such a variety of programmes in our Member States that if we had wanted to produce an atlas covering all the European states - and I am convinced that this is necessary, but we were not in a position to do it - the result would have been something resembling an encyclopaedia.

Consequently, we abandoned this approach for quite the opposite, which consisted of taking precise examples, areas where the European dimension was obvious and asking competent authors with international experience and a knowledge of different countries, different approaches, different cultures, to try to illustrate these themes not by dogmatic assertion but, quite the reverse, by showing the different possible approaches to the same phenomenon, demonstrating solidarity, interaction, the interconnection of certain problems at the level of European States. The result was this series of fifteen pedagogical dossiers, ten of which are currently at your disposal. I will not deny that this was an extremely difficult programme to set up, difficult to implement, incredibly complex in terms of concepts.

We tried hard to avoid these dossiers being slanted too much towards the national perspective. You will understand that this is not always possible. Thanks to many of you here today, for most of these dossiers we had a small network of thirty or forty teachers in a large number of member countries who agreed to read them and evaluate them from a teacher's point of view.

3. *Conclusions: What exactly is the European dimension?*

The European dimension is not, clearly, a discipline in itself. Nor is the solution simply to add one or two hours here and there to programmes on Europe. That said, it does not follow that this is a woolly concept. The European dimension does have a specific content. Mr Bartholomy demonstrated this very well in his part of the summary report. There is a history, a background, a concept, but that does not form the basis of a particular discipline.

On the other hand, it is obvious that the European dimension is an interdisciplinary element, especially in terms of content. But it is more than that. In all the discussions we had, it became clear to us that, without imposing a change of policy and without threatening the absolute sovereignty of states over the structure and content of their programmes, the introduction of the European dimension is a factor of change in the very design of programmes, introducing a plurality of approaches, developing an even greater analytical spirit, research, synthesis, tolerance. Even if it is not our intention to interfere with national programmes, or challenge the sovereignty of states, we must acknowledge that introducing the European dimension does involve giving some thought to programmes.

Another fundamental point which has often been put to us is: "By developing the European dimension, isn't that a form of European nationalism?" We must stress that promoting the European dimension is preparing children, pupils, students to be aware of the world and to be open to it. The European dimension must be open to the world, or it does not exist.

The European dimension (which has a specific content, yes, but is not a discipline), is also and above all - and the Assistant Secretary General himself made a point of this - a system of attitudes, a system of values. It is tolerance, it is pluralism, it is an open mind, it is freedom of thought; it is everything which together makes up the fundamental values of this body and is the reason for its being here today.

A system of attitudes, then. A system of values, but it is also a set of competences. The symposium we held in Berlin in March demonstrated this well. Nowadays it is clear that in the world in which we live there are some key competences which today's pupils can no longer afford not to possess if they want to avoid being second class citizens or avoid missing out on the opportunity to realise their potential in the coming years. These key competences are also the European dimension.

The European dimension is also an incentive towards a new pedagogy, or more precisely the illustration of a certain number of pedagogical principles which have been developed for some time. I will just give one example: "Learning to learn". That's a slogan which has often been bandied about. The European dimension gives wonderful scope for that slogan, because it necessarily involves research, consultation, international contact, debate, comparison and, ultimately, that's what "learning to learn" means. It also became evident that the European dimension is a favourable factor in the use of the new communication technologies. A short time ago we were talking about the "Web" as a means of developing the European dimension through research, dialogue, contact with others. This is, I believe, one of the elements of the education system which will best inspire and motivate intelligent, rather than merely superficial, use of the new technologies.

In terms of pedagogy, the European dimension is also an incentive, through its interdisciplinarity, for team work and for the development of educational teams involving not only teachers but everyone who is involved in education including the principals of educational establishments. The Essen symposium demonstrated this well, and Mr Letierce and Mr Forbes come back to this in their part of the summary report: the European dimension is also a factor for change in practical pedagogy.

With regard to the recommendations contained in the report produced by Messrs Bartholomy, Fyfe, Forbes and Letierce, I will concentrate on the main one: we will only be able to develop the European dimension by well prepared, properly evaluated and well designed, systematic experiments, based on fact and pragmatism.

We must be very careful. We have inherited a past in all branches and in all programmes. In each of our countries we have inherited visions of the world, and traditions which it would be very dangerous, pointless and wrong to challenge simplistically in the name of the European dimension. I even think that if we did this, we would probably achieve the reverse of what we are seeking, or would become turned in upon ourselves rather than open to diversity.

One final, purely technical, point. Mr. Luisoni said that at the beginning of the project we had hoped to bring at least ten pedagogical dossiers to the final conference, published by well-known publishers. For a whole series of reasons which it would take too long to go into now, that was not possible.

We have decided to change this plan, and to present these dossiers in a form which will enable you to see what it is possible to do. They are at your disposal. We have already had contacts with some national ministries, who are planning to publish some of these dossiers at national level.

I appeal to each of you and to each delegation. Look at these dossiers. If you think that some of them could be useful in your national context, either in the language in which they exist at present, or in another if you think you can have them translated, contact the Secretariat after the conference.

III. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AT THE FINAL CONFERENCE

Preliminary comments

The work of a general rapporteur is rather like that of a distiller of spirits. A final conference is, in effect, a sort of still. It starts with a heap of nicely ripe fruit, which has already started to ferment: publications, reports of symposia, summary documents. Then there is the boiler: the introductory speeches and the work of the groups; a series of condensation tubes and cooling pipes: the reports of the working groups; then one last series of pipes: the general report, which must collect up the drops of precious distillation and add exactly the right amount of the different ingredients to give a product which is, if possible, well balanced and full of flavour. It is a fascinating, but almost impossible, task as those of you who have had to perform this type of exercise will know!

After a few introductory comments, the following pages present the principal results of discussions on a number of themes of key questions concerning secondary education in Europe. As you can imagine, not all aspects have been dealt with at the conference in the same depth. Clearly, this is due to the wide geographical diversity, but also to the profile of the participants themselves, their knowledge of the project and the state of advancement of discussion and reform in the different national contexts.

Consequently, the report does not present conclusions in the usual sense of the word, formally adopted by the participants. It is rather a question of highlighting, very succinctly, a number of salient points arising out of the debates, designed above all to take stock of the situation and stimulate further discussion.

While remaining as faithful as possible to the opinions expressed at the final conference or during the project itself, the general rapporteur has taken the liberty, in addition, of referring to other sources and quoting other opinions in the form of ***Comments****: the concerns about secondary education are shared by a wide audience and are the subject of discussion in many locations, the conclusions of which are often converging or mutually enlightening. We therefore feel that, as it adds its own brick to the building, the project "A secondary education for Europe" which is coming to a close is enriched by the comments of others.*

6.1. Introduction

A world of tension ...

On three separate occasions we had the opportunity to listen to Jacques Delors, President of the UNESCO International Committee on education in the 21st century, presenting the principal conclusions of the report which had just been published. On each occasion, Mr. Delors pointed to "the heart of the problems of the 21st century", both for societies in general and their education systems, namely the tensions which have to be faced and overcome all over the world:

- *"****tension between the global and the local****: gradually becoming a citizen of the world without losing one's roots and while actively participating in the life of one's nation and local community;*

- *"****the tension between the universal and the singular****: the globalisation of culture is taking place progressively, but still only partially. It is unavoidable with its promises and its risks, not least of which is to forget the unique nature of each individual, his ability to choose his destiny and realise all his potential, in the richness of his traditions and his own culture, which current changes could threaten unless we take care";*

- *"****the tension between tradition and modernity****: adapting without being untrue to yourself, achieving independence while allowing others the freedom to develop, staying in control of scientific progress. This is how to meet the challenge of the new information technologies";*

- *"****the tension between the long term and the short term****. (...) Opinions call for replies and rapid solutions, whereas many of the problems encountered require a patient, concerted and negotiated strategy for reform. This is precisely the case with educational policies;*

- *"****the tension between essential competition and the concern for equality of opportunity****. This is a classic issue which has been posed in connection with economic and social policy and with educational policy since the beginning of the century. It is an issue which has at times been resolved, but never for long. Today, the Committee is taking the risk of saying that the constraints of competition make many managers forget that every human being should be given the wherewithal to* *while every opportunity. It was this which led us, in connection with the areas covered by this report, to reconsider and update the concept of lifelong education so as to reconcile the competition which stimulates, the cooperation which reinforces and the solidarity which unites";*

- *the tension between the extraordinary growth of knowledge and man's capacity to assimilate it (...) And yet school curricula are becoming fuller and fuller. We must therefore, in a clear strategy of reform, make choices, but only on condition that we preserve the essential elements of a basic education which teaches how to live better, through knowledge, experimentation and the construction of a personal culture;*

- *the tension between the spiritual and the material. Often without being aware of it or expressing it, the world thirsts for ideals and values which, to avoid offending anyone, we will call moral. What a noble task it is for education, to arouse in each individual, according to his traditions and convictions and while fully respecting the concept of pluralism, this elevation of thought and spirit above oneself to the universal. What is at stake here - and the Committee is weighing its words carefully - is the survival of mankind"*[4].

- finally, at the recent International Conference on Education in Geneva, Mr Delors added an additional element, characteristic of numerous countries, which is of considerable importance for educational policy: "*the tension between the market economy and a society of markets*". According to Mr Delors, this is a worrying drift because, in such a society, increasingly dominated by markets and their laws - more like the jungle than civilisation - politics - and consequently the concern for the common good - is relegated to the background, to make way for, in the very short term, the dividends of shareholders, often with no concern for medium-long term investment [illegible].

A Europe of tension

While the tensions raised by Mr Delors may be characteristic - with slight differences, obviously - of all societies on this planet, they are especially relevant to Europe, whose cultural specificity does appear to have been - and continues to be - continually confronted by opposing ideas. Edgar Morin, in "Penser l'Europe", demonstrates this well. The originality of European culture does not stem only from its inheritance: Judaeo-Christian, Greek thought, modern Science and Reason. "*It is having always been the producer/ product of a vortex of interaction and interference between multiple dialogues which have linked and opposed religion/reason, faith/doubt, mythical thought/critical thought, empiricism/rationalism, existence/idea, individual/universal, problematisa-tion/refoundation, philosophy/science, humanistic culture/scientific culture, old/new, tradition/change, reaction/revolution, individual/group, immanence/transcendence, Hamletism/Prometheism, Quixotism/Sanchism, etc.*"[5]. What characterises European culture for Edgar Morin is the continuity and intensity of these opposing ideas. "*What is important in European culture is not only the principal ideas*

---

[4]. see "L'éducation, un trésor est caché dedans", Report to UNESCO by the International Committee on education in the 21st century, chaired by Jacques Delors, Paris, Ed. UNESCO and Odile Jacob, 1996, pp.12 et seq.

[5]. E. Morin, "Penser l'Europe", Paris, 1990, Ed. Gallimard, coll. Folio, pp.147-148.

(Christianity, humanism, science, Reason), but rather these ideas and their opposites. The European spirit is not only in plurality and change, it is in the dialogue of pluralities which produces change. It is not in production of the new as such, it is in the antagonism of the old and the new (new for new's sake degenerates into fashion, superficiality, snobbery and conformity)[6]. So we have to abandon the idea of one harmonious, distinct Europe; similarly we can only reject any idea of a first Europe, and the idea of a "European" reality preceding divisions and antagonism. Each idea encompasses an element of undeniable truth, but cannot be cut off from its opposite truth, from which it is inseparable.

Tensions and education

The foregoing comments apply to European culture as a whole but clearly, too, to education systems which, throughout the development process, have always faced the same type of situation and tension. We need recall only a few of the classic oppositions which mark the history - ancient and modern - of education: teaching/learning, authority/liberty, personal development/social development, selection/open access, traditional school/new school, integration/differentiation, teacher-centred/child-centred, etc. etc. So, for Europeans, the real challenge is to find a balance, to integrate these inseparable and opposing ideas and Edgar Morin's comments will be able to throw some interesting light on educational reform and the idea of "novelty". Tension is an unavoidable fact; the real danger would be either to ignore it so as not to have to deal with it, or to permit one kind of tension to override everything else. Isn't that when the word crisis comes to mind? It is a term which can be applied to a number of areas at the present time. But what is interesting - and it was very obvious during this conference - is that Europeans, as a whole, understand this dual reality, accept it, and rather than simply observing it or complaining about it, strive to achieve some movement away from that position. Clearly this is a longer and more difficult road to take than conveniently simplifying matters, but in the long term it is the only one which appears to bring any solution. Apparently, in China, the ideogram used to signify "crisis" also means "misfortune" and "opportunity"! If there is a crisis, then, let us seize the opportunity to get under way with the idea - highlighted by Minister Pilip during the opening of the conference - that "there are no optimum policies, but rather optimised policies". This is equally true at national level and at European level, because education is at the heart of the problem: it is expected to transform tensions into links; it is in this context that the relatively new concept of the "world of education" (*"société éducative")* will find its meaning.

Five general observations

As we bring this introduction to a close, we would like to mention five points which have made an impression on us, points which are fundamental and which, without being exhaustive, highlight certain underlying factors of the project.

1. In view of what has already been said, it is not surprising that throughout the project, at symposia, seminars and case studies, and also in the summary reports, the introductory speeches and the discussions at this conference, the fundamental element which has arisen again and again is **to find a balance**. It would probably be more accurate to speak of a **process of balancing** education systems, in all their components, at whatever level, but at secondary level in particular. Education systems everywhere seem to be walking a tightrope,

---

[6] idem, pp.149-150.

subject to all kinds of tensions: political, economic, social, administrative, pedagogical. They are constantly struggling to keep their balance, and find something to serve as a balancing pole. The whole of the project which is today coming to a close is littered with balancing poles.

2. A kind of evidence has come to the fore, both explicitly, in a number of documents, and implicitly during the course of discussions. In their **search for quality by improving the education system**, particularly at secondary level, there is one aim which motivates all Europeans of western, central and eastern Europe: **greater democracy, less exclusion, greater participation, more partnerships and involvement.** This is evident in the different structures which are being put in place to help pupils achieve more success and improve their entry into the world of work; it is also evident in terms of aims and objectives, a sharing of competence and management, making schools more independent and more responsible, the design and reform of curricula and methods, the introduction and implementation of reforms. In this way it seems that the truly European dimension of secondary education is first that, and we should be pleased about it. It may not be one of the immediate results of the Council of Europe project, but one might reasonably assume that it has contributed to the development of these views.

3. Another striking fact which emerged during the project and in our conference debates is that rather than reforms as such - whether detailed or wider in scope - it is on the very foundations of the secondary education system that comment is increasingly focused. We could even say there is talk of **refoundation**. Personally, we do not much like the term "reform", probably because it has so often been used incorrectly; nevertheless, it retains its etymological connotation of "changing the form". Refounding signifies identifying and attempting to resolve fundamental problems; that's where we need to begin! In the past our systems have perhaps too often favoured questions of form, and as a result are not very well adapted to the realities of today. Moreover, the **systemic** nature of any adaptation is increasingly obvious: a change at one level of a system necessarily has repercussions on the level which precedes it and also on the level which follows it; all reform induces a sort of "chain reaction", both vertically and horizontally within the system.

4. There is a growing awareness of the fact that the educational institution can no longer meet all expectations, be the vessel of all hopes or be held responsible for all dysfunction. Education and training are increasingly seen as a responsibility of the whole of society: families, teachers, citizens, political powers, financial world, media, etc. However, the role of these spheres of society is often not clearly defined; just as there is a "hidden curriculum", there often also appears to be a "hidden contract", of which it is not always certain that the users of the system and those operating it have the same perception! The time has probably come - and this really is fundamental - to **redefine responsibilities, set up partnerships** and draw up real **contracts** between all concerned.

5. Finally, it has become evident at the end of this project and the final conference, that the adaptation of secondary education in Europe remains an **open and ongoing project.** Although some countries have implemented far-reaching reforms, sometimes by original routes, there are no obvious solutions which are common to all, or transferable. And yet there is evidence of converging undercurrents and perspectives. We have tried to summarise them in the pages which follow. They will, however, need to be developed, and there must be exchanges and discussions. The project which is coming to a close today has already made an enormous contribution to a better reciprocal understanding of realities in Europe and though there remains a good deal of work to be done with regard to secondary education, the same can be said of cooperation on educational issues in Europe.

3.2. Trends and challenges

First of all, the conference discussed the aims and objectives of secondary education in the face of society's demands, and the requirements of quality, values and the European dimension. Participants stressed the interest and relevance of the preparatory documents for the conference, especially the exhaustive and subtle analysis in Denis Kallen's summary report "Secondary education: an expedient concept". Group deliberations were preceded by an introduction by Mr **Gabor Halasz**, the text of which can be found in **Annex A.**

The principal discussions of the working groups are given below under four headings:

- secondary education for all
- a readjustment of aims and objectives
- the redefinition of general culture
- education and training: a public asset

These are presented in intentionally summarised form, accompanied by comments or quotations.

Secondary education for all

There is unanimous support for the belief that **the widespread availability of a quality education for all young Europeans until the age of 18/19 must become a reality**. This is not expressed a priori in terms of "extending compulsory schooling", but rather in terms of **users' rights** to this and the **duty of the "world of education"**[7] to provide it.

Already substantially developed and controlled in terms of institutionalisation, structures and functioning, this education is an absolute necessity. It is imposed equally by the **demands of society** and the **needs of the economy** for high levels of competence.

Open access and maintaining standards do not appear to be incompatible, provided the mechanisms used are adapted to the wide range of young people in education, endeavour to avoid exclusion and are based on an open, global, flexible, articulate and coherent model. Such a policy is founded mainly on the extensive **diversification of secondary education,** both in terms of structures and methods of teaching and learning. It must also be firmly fixed within the context of **"life-long education"**.

Comments

- Use of the term "education" rather than "schooling" or "teaching" is more than a question of vocabulary; it attempts to emphasise the need to dispense with the idea of a secondary level which is primarily "academic" or "scholarly" in nature, and propose instead a wide range of educational opportunities, in which vocational education in its many forms occupies an important place. There is also a change of perspective: by talking about "education", emphasis is placed on the ultimate goal, at the centre of which is the young person himself; if we talk about "schooling" on the other hand, the emphasis is on the teaching, the school, the institution.

---

[7] "Cognitive society" ("*Société cognitive*"), and "world of education" ("*Société éducative*") are concepts which are used with increasing frequency. In this context, would it not be better to speak of an "educating world" ("*société éducatrice*"), thereby underlining the active role of an environment which goes far beyond the educational institution alone?

- The demands of society, which are often expressed in terms of extending "education", improving its quality, and demands for a better general education for all are not always positively assessed. However, we must acknowledge that they have a dual legitimacy. On the one hand - and statistics are clear on this point[8] - more education means a better chance of finding a job and a reduced risk of unemployment (and this applies as much to the 25-35 age group as to those aged between 35 and 59), particularly long-term unemployment; it also often means higher wages. On the other hand, however, a better general training for all increasingly appears to a growing number of citizens to be a simple necessity for living in today's world, understanding it, coping with it and being capable of "flexibility" in an "active life" which too often tends to be reduced to a working life, forgetting its other dimensions (social relations, community and political life, leisure, etc).

Finding a balance between aims and objectives

The idea of a secondary education is an expedient concept[9], but it is not without ambiguity because, in reality, there have always been at least two secondary levels: the "*voie royale*", which is academic and leads to higher education (principally university) and "the other route", which is vocational and technical, and leads to the world of work.

The need and the will to **reduce** or even **eliminate the chasm** which separates these two routes are not new ideas; many countries are resolutely filling in the chasm, but it is a longwinded job because in the first place it requires a change of mentality and a reciprocal will to open up and change educational structures, courses and content. However, it appears that there is a genuine **overall trend towards breaking down barriers** in Europe; it involves **finding a balance between aims and objectives** which, while maintaining the specific nature of the two routes, attempts to create a **reciprocal opening up** with **opportunities to make choices and changes** mid-course.

The **priority objectives** of secondary education - **the acquisition of knowledge, personal development, socialisation** - are still valid but greater stress must be laid on their **indivisibility** and the need to aim at the development of genuine **competencies.**
Moreover, for many countries, there is an urgent need to balance objectives by placing greater emphasis on socialisation, because it lends an indispensable sense of responsibility and solidarity to individual freedom and independcance. It fosters an ability to communicate, to exchange views and challenge them; it fosters the recognition and acceptance of differences and learning to "want to live together"[10]. It constitutes a sort of "protective barrier" against intolerance, xenophobia and racism.
Without underestimating the contribution of the outside world to the socialisation of young people, we must always acknowledge the **privileged role** - often neglected - which **the educational institution,** a real "society of pupils", ought to play in social education and the teaching of democratic citizenship; we must not forget that, in the second cycle of secondary education, some pupils have already reached the age of majority.

---

[8] see for example: European Commission, White paper on education and training, "Enseigner et apprendre - Vers la société cognitive", Brussels, 1995, pp 103 et seq.

[9] see the summary report by D. Kallen.

[10] This is one of the four pillars of education, according to the report of the Delors Committee, together with "learning to know", learning to do", and "learning to be".

Comments

- The aims and objectives of secondary education were the subject of the project's first symposium, held in Paris. Refer to the published report.[11]

- We will come back to this report at a later stage on a number of issues raised. At this point we will simply quote two brief extracts:

- *"the education system should focus on training citizens, not economic agents"*;

- *"(...) a diploma can no longer offer any guarantee of employment unless it is accompanied by communications skills. Many young people leave school with no inkling of the competencies which will be essential in their working life: the ability to work as part of a group; team spirit and a sense of adventure; a sense of responsibility and personal discipline; a sense of decision and commitment; a sense of initiative, curiosity, creativity; a spirit of professionalism, the pursuit of excellence, a competitive spirit; the sense of service to the community, citizenship. These qualities constitute the basis of a spirit of enterprise"*.

It is interesting to note that these two comments come not from some "expert-dreamer" working within the Council of Europe, nor from a pedagogue out of touch with reality and with idealistic views on educational aims ... they are simply extracts from a publication of the "European Round Table of Industrialists"[12]

Redefinition of general culture

The idea that there is a need for a **redefinition of general culture**, which all young people ought to acquire, is widely accepted and desired. In view of the complexity of today's world, the speed and unpredictability of change and the explosion of knowledge and information sources, former models appear to be outdated.

Only a **wide-ranging, outward-looking culture, incorporating humanistic, scientific and technological components** will enable young people to create the basis of their personal and social identity, to understand the world, to play an active role in it and to take part in its construction and transformation. These three components are also essential for the **exercise of democracy**.

Far from being a mere accumulation of knowledge, general culture seen in this way focuses on developing **behaviour** and **attitudes**, a "way of being in the world". It therefore necessarily includes a **critical and ethical dimension**; just as much as its **content**, the method of **acquisition**, the **motivation** of young people and their desire to learn also play a decisive role.

Comments

- Insistence on the need to redefine general culture is not an original idea of the Council of Europe project. This idea occupies a very important place in a number of recent publications: for example, we could cite the report of the Delors Committee, the White Paper of the Committee on education and training[13], or the

---

[11] Taylor, W., Report of the Paris Symposium (June 1992) on "Aims and objectives of secondary education", Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1992.

[12] ERT, Une éducation européenne - Vers une société qui apprend, Brussels, 1994, p.13.

[13] European Commission, White paper on education and training, op. cit.

Opinion of the Economic and Social Council of the European Union on that same White paper. It is, therefore, a key element to be taken into account for the future. At the moment we are at the "declaration of intent" stage and this is an area which offers very stimulating prospects for international cooperation; it would be very easy to imagine that we are settling down to the task of defining, in terms of competencies, a sort of "common European Framework" concerning the general culture of all 15-19 year-olds.

- The ideal of general culture, as it is understood here, is a long way from what it is still commonly held to mean: a baggage of knowledge, learning or rather scholarly culture which will enable one, if not to shine, then at least to feel at ease in society! Here, what we are talking about, is the "baggage for life and survival" which every individual needs to live and become part of an increasingly complex, rapidly-changing society and world, characterised in particular by exchange, mobility, multiculturalism and multilingualism.

- the critical and ethical dimension of general culture applies to all areas. It is particularly necessary in view of the remarkable development of science and technology and their direct consequences on the daily life of the individual (genetic engineering, computer technology, information highways). Obviously we are not aiming to turn all young people into scientists or specialists, but rather to give them the knowledge, the know-how and the tools for reflection to enable them to be "enlightened users", capable of controlling and dominating, and seeing the positive aspects and the limits of progress. We could summarise all this with the expression "functional scientific and technological literacy for all"!

- We must also stress the fact that it serves little purpose to change content if we do not, at the same time, deal with the means of transfer and learning of general culture, and if we do not stimulate or appeal to the motivation of young people. This is perhaps the key to life-long learning and education worthy of the name ought to set itself the priority objective of stimulating a taste for learning and the pleasure of learning.[14] For his part, in a recent publication suggestively entitled: "The joy of learning and how to kill it", François de Closets recalls a number of points which could serve as "credo" for educators and as a message to be passed on to all young people (and adults!):

  Learning is:

  - *an effort* (no-one can do it for us)
  - *an enrichment* (not of having, but of being)
  - *an adventure* (you have to take risks; that is the price of pleasure)
  - *an initiation* (you possess a part of an immense heritage, which belongs to the whole of humanity)
  - *a pleasure* (in yourself and for yourself, regardless of your earnings)
  - *a point of departure* (once mastered, it opens up new avenues)
  - *an art of living* (the art of keeping alive as an adult the fire that Montaigne wanted to light in the child)"[15]

The role of the State: education and training, a "public asset"

Even if they have not, as yet, led to a dismantling of the education system at secondary level[16], the **material constraints** (budgetary ceilings or restrictions) and the need for **quantifiable results** and a certain **loss of confidence** in the ability of the public authorities to fulfil their function, weigh heavily on those involved in the education system: the authorities, principals and teachers.

In many countries, the pressure - whether open or concealed - of an increasingly powerful pan-economic power intent on deregulation and submitting education in general to the laws of free enterprise, obliges the public authorities to **redefine and relegitimise their**

---

[14] This aspect receives strong emphasis in the Delors Committee's report.

[15] de Closets, F., Le bonheur d'apprendre et comment on l'assassine, Paris, 1996, Seuil, pp.342 et seq.

[16] see the summary report by Denis Kallen.

responsibility and their mission. Nevertheless, it seems clear that all over Europe the **State** and the **public authorities** will continue to play **a central role**; it is, perhaps, around the notion of an **education recognised as being a "public asset"** that a new consensus could be established, the State retaining its competence but sharing it with other partners with a view to diversifying the parties involved and the places where education takes place.

This view does not in any way exclude measures to promote **more effective management** of the education system, whose "new public management" is one of the best-known illustrations.

Comments

- The issue of redefinition of the role of the State has been raised in all European countries, not only with regard to the financing of education, but first in terms of centralisation/decentralisation or rather the sharing of powers and competence and management of the system. We will return to this at a later stage. However, as stressed in the report on the seminar on education held in Strasbourg in December 1993 in the context of the CSCE: "*the political challenge facing States is to find a balance between protecting the social, cultural and economic rights of the individual and the legitimate demands for profitability of the education system. The objective must be to achieve not only a more developed, but a more democratic society. In this respect, mass deregulation offers no guarantee of social justice*".

- the question of the pre-eminence of the pan-economic over the political[17] does constitute a challenge of prime importance for democracy itself. Three short quotations from Alain Touraine give a good demonstration of this problem:

  - "*The most effective democratic struggle is against power being in hands of the wealthy.*"

  - *The idea of citizenship proclaims the political responsibility of each individual and consequently defends the voluntary organisation of social life against the non-political logic which some claim to be "natural", "market" or "in the national interest*".

  - "*There is no democracy without market economy but there are many countries with a market economy which are not democratic.*""[18]

- By raising the issue of the role of the State, we find ourselves facing the considerable tensions with which education systems are often confronted these days. Should the State, as some people believe, simply identify the needs, give those involved autonomy and responsibility, drawing a clear distinction between tasks of authority and their tasks of provision? Should the public authorities, on the other hand, fulfil all tasks which stem from their role of prescribing, delivering and validating education? Is it not the role of the education system itself to define how it will meet the different and conflicting demands with which it is faced? In this case, the State will be called upon as a priority to play its role as regulator, which does not in any way exclude negotiation with those on the outside. In this respect, the debate is still wide open.

- There is no question, here, of entering into a detailed argument justifying State intervention in the area of education. We are referring simply to a concept arising out of economic theory, the concept of "public asset" or "public service"[19]. In fact, it seems to us that it can throw some interesting light in this context.

---

[17] In his opening address, Mr. Leuprecht, Assistant Secretary General of the Council of Europe made a clear reference to this danger, which he considers to be real for both Europe and the rest of the world.

[18] Touraine, A., Qu'est-ce la démocratie?, Paris, Fayard, 1994, pp. 75, 101, 220.

[19] see Grin, F., L'économie de l'éducation et l'évaluation des systèmes de formation, Rapport de tendances, University of Geneva, National Research Programme 33, 1994. "In economic theory, a public asset has two important features: (i) there is no competition for consumption (ie the fact that X

As Grin says: "It is true that education, as a process, can very easily be provided by the private sector alone (even if it is at a price which excludes whole sections of the population): there is the possibility of exclusion and competition which, even though it may not be total as it would for a private asset, is not non-existent either, so that education as a process is rather like a "club asset", which is a specific type of goods in economic theory. However, this ceases to be true if education and training are seen as a stock *of acquired characteristics. No private enterprise will sell "the dissemination of public spiritedness in society", for instance. Education systems help to train individuals, certain features of whose behaviour (good citizenship and sociability, for example), where these manifest themselves outside their private sphere, can be "consumed" by third parties without competition, without any possibility of exclusion. If society acknowledges these features have some value, the intervention of the State is justified"*.[20]

- the problems of more efficient management of the education system are also at the heart of the concerns expressed by the countries of Europe as a whole. It is an extremely complex issue because it involves the political, the administrative, the financial and even the "ideological". The concept of "new public management" is meeting with great success in many countries. Clearly it is attractive, as long as the motivation and objectives regarding its use are quite clear. The new public management can, in effect, have different objectives: increasing the responsibility of the participants, fostering independence, promoting, securing and verifying quality, increasing efficiency. But its aims might also be: renouncing responsibility, making savings, privatising, making competition work, deregulating, measuring and comparing, covering the cost of services, etc. It would therefore appear to be important that for this new public management to be acceptable, in other words in the service of a clearly-defined global policy, it must constitute a tool and not become an aim - or a new ideology - in itself.

3.3. Prospects and strategies

In the second part of the final conference, the participants discussed issues relating to structures, management of the system and partnerships, content and methods of learning, assessment of pupils, schools and educational policies, human resources, innovation and reform processes, as well as the European dimension. Of course they referred to Denis Kallen's report, which has already been mentioned, and to the report entitled "The European dimension: summary report" by Dominique Barthélémy, Raymond Ryba, César Bîrzea and Jean-Michel Leclercq. J-M. Leclercq also presented the general introduction to this second party of the group deliberations; the text of his address can be found in **Annex B**.

Structures

To begin with, it appears that regardless of the structures which have been set up, **three main principles** must be respected:

- **routes, subjects and options** must be **clearly identified**, as must the **realistic prospects** they can offer;
- **transparency** and **simplicity**, to permit users to derive benefit from them;
- **flexibility**, to avoid positions of deadlock.

---

benefits from an asset does not in any way prevent Y from benefiting equally from it; (ii) there is no possibility of exclusion (that is to say it is not possible to restrict access to the asset in question and, in particular, consumption of it cannot be reserved to those who have paid for it)"(p.90).

[20] idem. pp.90-91.

The principal concern focuses on the need for all systems to **diversify the courses** on offer. Such diversification is a necessary response to the **needs expressed by the economic world.** But it has an equally important **social and democratic** aim. It allows education systems to meet their obligation to take account of pupil diversity and to value all abilities, so as to keep school failures to a minimum and avoid large numbers of pupils being (or feeling) left out.

As regards the **first cycle**, the trend is no longer to contrast "streaming" and "integrated classes". Neither appears to be a panacea and the trend is to reconcile - by solutions of **balanced integration** or **"articulated flexibility"** - both the need to avoid decisions on which direction to take being taken too early and the need to offer each pupil the opportunity to develop every aspect of his ability.

With regard to **specialisation in the second cycle of secondary education**, the following key elements have been identified as conditions for success:

- **a degree of flexibility with regard to educational structures, offers, routes, locations and methods** (options, sandwich courses, dual system, part-time, etc.), while avoiding atomisation of possible courses;
- **diversification**, not only of structures, but also of **curricula and methods of teaching and learning**;
- **coherence**, which is not only **structural** (streaming) **but internal to the system**, which focuses on the continuing development - with different requirements - of aptitudes common to the different routes;
- **flexibility, both horizontal** (bridging classes) **and vertical** (continuing with a period of interrupted study, "à la carte" courses, "second chance" education, etc.)., within the context of life-long education;
- appropriate **provisions for guidance**, available at a sufficiently early stage, and **provisions for support** during the course of education.

The diversification of secondary education, provided it avoids atomisation and stems from a global, coherent and sufficiently flexible vision, also constitutes an effective means of **eliminating** - or at least softening - the **line separating general education and vocational education**. In terms of prospects and strategies, four elements have been highlighted:

- Those responsible for the education system and those responsible for the economy must sit down at the same table and **initiate a genuine dialogue**. Perhaps never so much as today have the goals of education and the demands of the economic world been so similar. What does education want? To see the acquisition of wide-ranging, individual and social skills. What does the economy, including small- and medium-sized firms, increasingly demand? Exactly the same thing!
- **Refocus vocational education** (avoiding specialisation) and **extend the proportion allocated to general education**, so that this leads to an **equivalent** - but different - **qualification** to that awarded in general education (for example, a vocational baccalaureate).

- **Developing vocational education** as a route which remains open **at the top**, giving access to higher education. Obviously this calls for the appropriate **diversification of higher education** (university and non-university) and an **appropriate policy with regard to access.**

- Increase contact (by means of visits, training courses, exchanges, etc.) between these two worlds which all too often are unaware - whether intentionally or not - of each other's existence, namely the world of education and the world of work. Only **reciprocal openness** will lead to a change of mentality; this openness and the contact referred to are necessary not only for young people but also - and possibly above all - for teachers.

Comments

- First, two quotations to illustrate the convergence of aims between the world of education and the economy:

  "A balanced basic education should produce "a complete person" rather than a specialist. It is in this spirit that we advocate an all-round education.

  The fundamental aim of education is to help each individual to develop his full potential and become a complete human being, rather than a tool of the economy. The acquisition of knowledge and competencies must be accompanied by education of the personality, a cultural opening up and an awakening of social responsibility.

  Learning the fundamental values is of vital importance, because it equips individuals for life. Education is the most effective tool for exercising democracy. Nowadays, citizens are called upon the use their judgement, via their vote, by pronouncing on fundamental issues which are decisive for the future of society. Appropriate use of the democratic vote depends on the critical capacity of the individual with regard to the choices on offer and his ability to resist propaganda.

  In a world bent on accelerated change, rapid obsolescence and the continuing extension of skills, schools must inculcate a method of learning, a taste for study and enthusiasm for discovery into future citizens. The process of permanent education is closely associated with this requirement. Its aim is, very clearly, learning to think and to learn without ever stopping."[21]

- *"Technical know-how is good, but personal and social know-how is even better!" This was one of the principal conclusions of a recent forum organised at Glion (Switzerland) devoted to the problem of economic revival as a solution to the crisis. "Accept the challenges of education! Improve it for everyone, whatever their age, whatever their occupation. Let's all improve, become more effective". These simple words calling for effectiveness and performance infuriate those who, not without reason, can no longer tolerate the cult of competition and kowtowing to the harsh laws of productivity. However, if they had been there to hear the debate at Glion, they would have been surprised.*

  What did they have to say, these managers of firms big and small, who had come to enter into a dialogue with the people responsible for education in schools, vocational training establishments and universities? That schools should meekly serve the economy? That they should prepare the employees of the future - docile, studious, brimming with technical knowledge? Not a bit of it! It is not only knowledge that matters, they said in unison, not only know-how. What needs to be cultivated is savoir-être"; in other words, the personality of the citizen-worker, his general culture, his ability to express himself, to take the initiative. Firms don't need sheep, but responsible employees. Individuals who feel good about themselves and are happy.

  Of course the entrepreneurs present were nothing like those stiff, conservative bosses who are all in favour of lower wages or schools being able to select their "elites" at the earliest possible opportunity. But even so it was striking to hear the demand for more languages, more history and even more philosophy in the curriculum rather than more immersion in computer technology or economics.

---

[21] European Round table of Industrialists, referred to above.

Another widely-expressed wish: that schools should be more actively outward-looking, that teachers should step outside the world where so many of them are confined from 4 to 65! But is the institution really capable of changing in this way? The heads of state education departments present were convinced it was.[22]

- *Even though, as Denis Kallen states in his summary report, higher education "remains a jungle" weighing what some may consider to be too heavily on secondary education, and access to it is still often difficult, significant overtures are evident in many countries and internationally. As evidence of this, we can quote, for example, the final conference of the project of the CDCC Committee on Higher Education and Research entitled "Quality-Equality - access to higher education: values and policies" which was held in Parma in September 1996. Among the recommendations adopted, we quote here number 4 - Admissions:*

  "The following recommendations are addressed to Member States and establishments of higher education:

- ***to extend admission criteria based on certificates of secondary education so that in addition they take account of the individuality of the student in terms of cultural baggage and past record;***
- *to recognise the value of higher level vocational education as a preparation for higher education;*
- *to give credit for previous experience;*
- *to ensure transparency with regard to entrance criteria;*
- *to direct recruitment strategies towards candidates from a variety of social backgrounds;*
- *in conjunction with secondary education, to put in place appropriate and objective information, guidance and advisory services at the pre-admission stage to allow for genuine diversification of objectives."[23]*
- *With regard to guidance, here are a few thoughts from Jean-Luc Mure to conclude: "For a long time guidance has been thought of as a simple procedure of matching individuals with jobs, designed for pupils at the pre-vocational education stage. Today it is multi-faceted and is a continuous educational process of devising and implementing plans, which begins when pupils start secondary school and continues throughout their school career and their social and professional lives. In a socio-economic context which is both complex and uncertain, simple procedures for managing flows of pupils, even if they are still necessary, are no longer sufficient to "guide" young people. Consequently, guidance becomes a matter which concerns us all and, within the school system, teachers, as well as vocational guidance advisers and parents. Indeed, teachers are progressively faced with new problems of supporting their pupils through "assistance with drawing up a personal vocational plan."[24]*

Managing the system and partnerships

The transfer of responsibility, the sharing of competence, a new method of management and greater autonomy for schools: without doubt, these constitute one of the most typical features of the evolution taking place in education systems, particularly at secondary level.

---

[22] Pilet, J., Le Nouveau Quotidien, November 1996.

[23] see General report by Nathan Deen, Strasbourg, DECS-HE 96/49 prov.

[24] Mure, J-L., "Nécessité et possibilité de former les enseignants du second degré à l'orientation face aux exigences d'une approche éducative", in Savoir-Education-Formation, Paris, Ed. Sirey, No 4 - 1995, p.613.

There is a kind of wave[25] sweeping western Europe as much as central or eastern Europe that is based, among other things, on a will to **introduce a more efficient and democratic functioning** to the systems. Although terms such as "centralisation/decentralisation" and "top-down or bottom-up strategies" are sometimes useful to define this movement, we must go beyond this rather simplistic distinction, or opposition. Whether it is a matter of top to bottom or bottom to top, the fundamental problem to be resolved remains **the balance to be established between centrifugal and centripetal forces, between the need for coherence of the system as a whole** (at national level) **and the exercise of greater autonomy** (in terms of freedom and responsibility) at other levels (regional, local).

It is only in terms of **partnerships** that such an operation can be put in place and be effectively managed; this is particularly true for schools which have ever more autonomy. A number of **framework conditions** appear to be necessary for the success of such partnerships:

- the **political will** of all partners;

- appropriate **legal instruments**, clearly defining the respective competence of the different partners: Central government, authorities at the different levels and schools, and defining the role of each of them in the form of a contract;
- appropriate **organisation** and **politico-administrative structures**;

- a **clear definition of the roles** of the various parties involves (principals, teachers, parents, education community as a whole and the pupils themselves);

- a **precise definition** of the **status** and **role of teachers** and their autonomy within the school;

- the **setting up of an "interface"**, of structures for dialogue, cooperation and guidance (steering committee, board, etc.), both for the school itself (educational team) and its environment (educational community);

- setting aside the **time** required for such cooperation;

- the **common will** to cooperate, work in a team, implement a pedagogical plan, and identification with a "school culture" on the part of all partners, both internal and external;

- an effective **information** and **public relations policy**.

Comments

- These issues were addressed on numerous occasions at the symposia, but especially at the Fuldatal Symposium; refer to the report[26]

---

[25] In his summary report, Denis Kallen states that "in this area, a page of the history of education has been, or is about to be, turned."

[26] Mitter W., Report of the Symposium held at Fuldatal (October 1992) on "The school in the local community: autonomy and responsibility", Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1993.

- *On issues of centralisation/decentralisation, we could refer to a very interesting recent OECD publication. For example, it contains the following comments: "For fifteen years, the decision-making structures of many education systems have often undergone dramatic change. This has been accompanied by often lively debate with regard to the degree of decentralisation desirable. Reports commissioned by the OECD on certain national educational policies are a good source of information on the arguments presented. They concern four types of consequence of the decision-making process: democracy, equality of opportunity, the ability of the system to change and, finally, its ability to be governed... (...) Consequently, the debate surrounding the decentralisation of education systems involves fundamental values, and in several dimensions. The arguments put forward strongly suggest that the optimum solution is a form of articulation between centralisation and decentralisation."*[27]

- This final conference also highlighted the value of this participative and cooperative approach of the partnership. This makes it possible to:

- heed the needs of the whole of the educational community and respond to them in the most appropriate way (proximity);

- resolve problems more effectively, because there is a feeling of being involved;

- help to adapt change and reforms and so ensure their better implementation by being responsible for, rather than subjected to, decision-making;

- motivate partners and strengthen their commitment;

- strengthen mutual confidence and commitment to a joint project;

- practise effective democracy.

- The partnership cannot be limited to the execution phase of projects or reforms, but must also be involved in initiating, formulating, launching, implementing and evaluating them.

- It takes time to set up an effective partnership, but it is likely to increase the educational potential of the principal participants (parents, families, authorities, educational team, firms, media, etc) with a consequent improvement in the quality of the education.

- *The school, seen as a learning community, may become a preferred location for teachers and other educational personnel, for the organisation of more effective continuing education. However, working as part of a partnership is complex and demanding and so calls for appropriate training for all concerned.*

- *The advantages for the school - but this could apply equally to the whole of the education system) - of developing an effective information and public relations policy is a rather novel idea which is not often put into practice. It could certainly constitute an interesting subject of study and exchange of "good practice" within the Council of Europe). Everywhere, the school is at the centre of many debates, often public. That is not surprising if we see education as a public asset. However, through a lack of information, many misunderstandings still exist. By speaking out and letting people see all the good which is achieved in our educational establishments, schools can only improve their image with the outside world. Public relations should be a natural part of the culture of the establishment and, where this is the case, it has been possible to boost the self-confidence and identification of those involved with their "learning establishment". What schools need to do is to both present themselves to the outside world and allow the outside world to come into school (parents, artists, professionals of every kind, politicians, people from the economic world, etc.). There are many ways of doing this, from holding open days to publishing a newspaper, or making regular appearances on local television. Another rather original example is the lycée which organises twice-weekly "table d'hôtes" attended by the head, teachers, parents, company managers and other interested parties, etc.*

---

[27] OECD/CERI, Les processus de décision dans 14 systèmes éducatifs de l'OCDE, Paris, OECD, 1995, pp.35+37.

Content and methods of learning

The question of **content** and **methods** - or curricula - occupies a **central place** in the problems of secondary education. The results of the many reforms undertaken in this area over many years have often been disappointing; the main criticisms are of their cumulative nature, centred in particular on knowledge and disciplines; they have rarely been accompanied by a change in teaching methods.

The **prospects** for the future could be **promising** if emphasis were placed squarely on **the acquisition and mastery of knowledge and know-how defined in terms of competencies and key competencies**, rather than in terms of content divided up into disciplines to which a certain number of teaching periods are devoted. By focusing more on learning than on teaching, by favouring "learning by doing", this approach would give knowledge some meaning and introduce genuine interdisciplinarity. The very structure of programmes would be transformed, as would didactic measures (active pedagogy), assessment, the role of the teacher, the organisation of school time and even management of the system. It is, however, a very demanding and complex approach.

Often in association with key competencies, the problems of a "**common core**" (or national curriculum) are also a major subject of debate and action in Europe. In fact, there is a marked trend, in keeping with a new sharing of competence, to devise programmes to serve as a "national global framework", while leaving some degree of freedom for the lower levels of the system. Such programmes are known as "framework programmes or study plans", "minimum objectives" or "skills bases"; the latter may vary in the degree to which they are precise or restrictive. However, if there is **consensus in principle**, the definition of the **components of these programmes** and the creation of effective tools for their evaluation poses important problems, which international cooperation could usefully help to solve. Indeed there is in these problems a real European dimension; we simply need to think of the importance of a common framework of reference for the recognition of educational routes and qualifications.

Comments

1. In his summary report, D. Kallen states: "*Educational reform indeed means in our days in the first place, and often almost exclusively, curriculum reform. Adapting education to new developments in science and society and giving education a new purpose is not so much any more a matter of changing the structure of the educational system, of creating new types of schools. The curriculum has become the privileged instrument through which educational reform is pursued*"[28].

2. During the course of the project, issues of content, curricula, programmes and key competencies were addressed in depth at the Porsgrunn[29] and Bern[30] symposia.

3. With regard to the complexity of an approach centred on the acquisition of competencies, we can quote an extract from the conclusions drawn by Walo Hutmacher at the Bern symposium: "*By stressing the clarification of the concept of competency and its implications, the symposium revealed that while it may clearly be indispensable, it is not enough to proclaim key competencies to be the general purpose of*

---

[28] Kallen, D., op.cit., p.122.

[29] Dugast-Portes, F., General report, Symposium held at Porsgrunn (October 1993) on "Contents and Methods in Secondary Education", Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 1994.

[30] Hutmacher, W., General report, Symposium held at Bern (March 1996) on "Key competencies for Europe", Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 1996.

> *education. No one opposes this goal even though, in many countries, the necessary political process of defining and specifying the intended competencies (in the widest sense of the word) has still not been gone through. For both individuals and collective groups, it is becoming vital to educate young people so that they are prepared to master indispensable cultural, technical, intellectual and social knowledge and know-how (...)*
>
> *One thing leads to another: behind the question of competencies or key competencies is a whole set of inter-related problems. If they are to adhere to a goal of demanding education for the greatest number, education systems and schools have to query not only curricula and teaching methods, but also the ways in which they operate, which are often long-established. The goal of educating pupils in competencies requires that their situation and experience of school be taken into account to a far greater degree than in the tradition of transmitting knowledge and beliefs, and that the ways in which they are involved and participate in the educational project be re-examined. The role and place of teachers will change: while they will become more responsible for pupils' school careers and learning, they will also have to take greater control over the conditions under which they and their pupils work. Control over time, space and grouping is particularly crucial. There then arises the question of how schools function and, at an overall level, that of how schools and the education system are guided and governed. (...) Perhaps the greatest challenge to schools, and the key to their progress, is to adopt a systemic approach.*[31]

- With regard to international cooperation, and in keeping with what is currently being undertaken in the context of the Council of Europe's "modern languages" project, we should clearly very carefully study the possibility of together creating a sort of common (or at least converging) framework for secondary education, based on essential key competencies for all young Europeans.

Evaluation and assessment

All education systems are attaching **increasing importance to evaluation and its procedures**. This is not surprising because evaluation is intended to show pupils, parents, teachers, schools, the school authorities, the political powers and society as a whole the results of education, in terms of **effectiveness** and **efficiency** - in other words, **quality.** The very concept of evaluation has undergone a very marked change over the last ten years; it no longer concerns only **pupils** and their performance, but also **schools, teachers** and **the education system** in general.

The role played by evaluation has increased as a result of a sharing of competence, greater school autonomy, budgetary constraints and the call for education to give account of itself. Although the **need** for evaluation is **well recognised**, it is **complicated to implement;** a purely "quantitative" approach is often only cursory, whereas an approach of a "qualitative" nature is difficult to justify in the absence of any objective criteria. Consequently, it seems that it is only by **varying** and **combining a range of procedures** that we can hope to achieve satisfactory results.

In the second cycle of secondary education, **pupil assessment** is still rather traditional on the whole and tends to be summative; in this way it fulfils an essentially selective and certifying function and is based on the measurement of performance. However, in common with current practice at other levels of education, greater attention is being paid to the learning processes themselves and to **formative assessment**. In many countries, too, an effort is being made to take account during assessment not only of knowledge, but of **know-how** and **attitudes**.

On the whole, better assessment involves "professionalisation": reinforcing the professional competence of teachers in assessment, on the one hand and, on the other hand, devising tools which are valid, reliable and managable.

---

[31] op.cit., pp.21-22.

For a number of years, **the evaluation of schools** has been a constant concern. Although the results attained by pupils may seems to be an important parameter, we must also consider other indicators which take account of the particular situation in each school: pupil/teacher ratio, the qualifications of teaching staff, available financial resources, social background of the pupils, socio-economic context, etc. Over and above strictly measurable results, the concept of **"value added"** by the school can be an interesting criterion. Generally speaking, there is agreement that school evaluation ought to combine **internal evaluation** (self-evaluation) with **external evaluation**. With this in mind, the role of the inspectorate ought to be redefined. As to the need (or otherwise) to publish results, this raises a number of delicate issues and must be handled with great care.

Teacher appraisal is also an extremely sensitive issue. As a measure linked to financial status (performance-related pay), it is thought to be unproductive, and often gives rise to tension and conflict within schools. As a measure leading to better teaching and job satisfaction, it is viewed more favourably. It appears that the methods most likely to succeed are those which call for the **voluntary participation** of teachers at specific stages of their career and **at the same school** and which combine **self-appraisal and peer appraisal**. It has also been noted that the general attitude of teachers to their appraisal is directly related to the "school ethos": working atmosphere, weight of the hierarchy, inter-personal relationships within the team, mutual trust, educational plan, etc.).

In conclusion, the final conference considered that **international cooperation** is still not sufficiently developed in matters of evaluation and assessment. However, comparative studies published in recent years have been widely read and had an often beneficial effect in many countries. Given the importance of evaluation in terms of educational policy and the fact that it is, moreover, a complex issue, if we want to go further than simply measuring pupil performance, it would seem to be desirable that the Council of Europe, in collaboration with other international organisations, should develop activities to this end in the future.

Comments

- During the project, the subject of evaluation was studied in depth at the Birmingham symposium (United Kingdom). The two reports published on that occasion refer.[32]

- Evaluation always means: seeking to determine the quality - not only effectiveness in the strictest sense of the word - of schools or teachers. But first we need to know "What constitutes a good school?" or "What makes a good teacher?" OECD/CERI has conducted some very interesting research on this. In a recent working document on school failure, we can read: "*Many studies have been published on the subject of the effectiveness of the school, for example the paper written by Purkey and Smith (1983), which is still relevant today. According to the OECD report on the quality of schools (OECD 1989), educational establishments are effective when they apply a coherent global policy, when their objectives are well defined, when their programmes are well integrated, when pupils devote the maximum amount of time to precise tasks and have the advantage of coherent pedagogical direction, when teachers are continually improving themselves, work in teams and have high expectations of their pupils, when order and discipline reign, when formative assessment takes place on a regular basis and, finally, when there is close cooperation with parents and the local authority*[33]. In another OECD study, we can again find a list of "characteristics of good schools", of which there are eight: "visions and values, organisation of teaching and learning, administrative measures, processes for the formulation of educational policy, staff training, in-service training of teachers, relations with the educational community and the local education authority, school ethos"[34]. This study also contains an in-depth analysis of the quality of teachers. Finally, improving the quality of education - which is, after all, the aim of any evaluation - is fundamentally dependent, again according to this study, on three factors which it is necessary, not to address separately, but to "reconcile": the teacher, the school and the political environment outside the school[35].

---

[32] Bradley, D., "Pupil assessment, School Evaluation and Policy Development, OFSTED, s.l.n.d. and Melissen, M., Report of the Symposium held in Birmingham (March 1995) on "Certification des élèves, évaluation des systèmes et politique éducative", Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1996.

[33] OECD, "Lutte contre l'échec scolaire: rapport sur l'activité - Partie 2: rapport de clarification", working document with limited distribution, November 1996, p.23.

- Evaluation, too, has become a multi-faceted problem: political, economic, pedagogical, technical and even ethical. It is, moreover, good that this huge problem area should be tackled from every angle and not be reduced to being defined in terms of items, tests or standards. What is more, the issue of the aims and methodology of evaluation should be at the centre of the debate. This is not always the case, as Michel Lecointe points out in a rather provocative manner: *"I do not think that a culture of evaluation ought to be marked by the diffusion of evaluation techniques and an increase in the practice of evaluation, by an itching for evaluation, that is to say the "evaluationitis" we see today. But rather by moving from the denial of values to the production of values (...) It is when a society is suffering a lack of values that it itches for evaluation. Wherever this occurs, there is compulsive agitation, and it is because there is no guidance that there is a running around in every direction, and because there is no direction there is unsystematic evaluation, and because there are no more benchmark values that there is "mis-direction" ("métrise")"*[36]

Human resources

The everyday implementation of the changes referred to above clearly poses an acute **problem with regard to teaching staff and the compatibility of their training and their function.** The image of a teacher, specialised in a particular discipline, standing alone in front of his class, is often still a reality. However, it no longer corresponds to the demands of the teaching function and the educational expectations of the school. A "transmitter of knowledge", the teacher is often called upon to become an educator, an animator and even, at times, a social assistant. Given the growing heterogeneity of pupils, the redefinition of the objectives of secondary education, the reform of curricula, working methods and evaluation and the increasing autonomy of schools, **new perspectives** must be envisaged. No single individual, whatever his education and qualities, can reasonably expect to fulfil a function which everyone agrees has become much too complex and difficult.

Increasingly, it seems that the **basic unit** of the education system - particularly in secondary education - is no longer the class, but **the school itself and its environment.** We need to move on from an individualistic view of the roles ("me and my speciality"!) of the different parties - teachers and non-teachers -to one of joint responsibility and partnership ("us and our school"!). Consequently it is around a **multiprofessional "educational team"**, that teaching and learning should be organised and life within the school managed; the teaching team should also be open to the outside and to what constitutes the **"educational community"** (families, school and political authorities, economic world, associations, etc.). Such an operational structure is essential for conducting a **teaching project** worthy of the name. There is another advantage to this approach: it introduces the interesting idea of **"collective competencies of the team"**: each individual contributes his own competence, but he is not expected to have competence in everything.

---

34. OECD, "La qualité de l'enseignement", Paris, 1994, pp.101 et seq.

35. idem, pp.129-134.

36. Lecointe, M., "Evaluation: de la constante macabre ... à la production de valeurs", in Savoir-Education-Formation, op.cit., pp.661 and 669.

There are clearly many requirements associated with this type of operation: first, there are those which concern the **partnership** and which we have already touched upon in this report; we must add to that the need for **participative management** of all the school's human resources; in this respect, the role of the **principal** is all-important.
In terms of **training**, the consequences of these new perspectives are also important. By and large, a good deal of **progress** has been made in Europe in the **initial training** of teachers; raising the level of requirements, extending training, "professionalisation", a better balance between theory and practice, the development of pedagogical and didactic skills, links with research, use of new technology, etc. However, too little importance seems still to be given to **self-evaluation** ("self-critical teacher"), to **relationship and communication skills**, to **interdisciplinarity**, to **exchanges** and to **teamwork**; yet, in reality, these are just as important as pedagogical skills.

The training of non-teaching staff - including principals or administrators - is also too often neglected. As for **continuing education** - even though the idea of lifelong education seems to be unanimously popular - this is still an underdeveloped concept in many countries. Of the promising trends, however, we must mention the encouragement given to **continuing in-service training (within the school itself)**, whereby it is possible to meet the real needs of those involved, to take advantage of available skills ("peer training") and even become an important element of the school's "guidance tools".

Comments

- Even though essential issues concerning training were addressed at the Estoril seminar on "Human Resources"[37] and at the symposium held at La Villette on the training of teachers of science and technology[38], the project on secondary education has not dealt with the subject of initial and continuing teacher training directly or in any depth. In any event, this would have duplicated a number of recent studies published on this matter by the OECD, for example[39]. We could also at this point mention that "Reinforcing the role of the teacher in a changing world" was the subject of the 45th Session of the UNESCO International Conference on Education (October 1996). The Declaration and Recommendations adopted on that occasion constitute an invaluable reference tool. In another connection, for the European regional consultation organised by UNESCO and the Council of Europe in Warsaw in April 1996, a number of excellent documents - analysing the situation in Europe and prospects for change - were produced by J. Savova[40], M. Galton[41], S. Lorentzen[42] and J-A. Fernandez[43]. This last author puts forward a very

---

37. see Taylor, D., Report of the seminar held at Estoril (May 1996) on "The development of human resources for secondary education in Europe: teaching and non-teaching staff, today and tomorrow", Strasbourg, Council of Europe 1996.

38. see De Vries Marc J., Report of the Symposium held at La Villette on "Science and technology teacher training: what training for what type of teaching?", Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 1994.

39. OECD, "L'enseignant aujourd'hui: fonctions, statut, politiques", Paris, 1990 and OECD, "La qualité de l'enseignement", op.cit.

40. Savova, J., "L'éducation et les enseignants dans les pays d'Europe centrale et orientale: 1991-1995", Geneva, BIE, 1996.

41. Galton, M., "La formation des enseignants en Europe", Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 1996.

stimulating thesis about the school as an "educational undertaking" and on the "collective professionalism" of teachers.

- Other factors referred to in an intentionally brief manner in this part of the report would need to be gone into in far greater detail to avoid their remaining mere slogans or fads. This is the case, among others, of the concept of "school autonomy" or of the "plan". The latter term could, in effect, cover very different sets of circumstances from, for example, the "pupil's plan" (individual learning strategy) to the "school plan" (a real education and economic policy drawn up by the school for itself), taking in along the way the "teaching plan" (centred on pedagogical practice and transdiciplinarity) or the "educational action plan" (framework activity which leads to action or implementation)[44]. In an extension of its activities on secondary education, the Council of Europe could foster further reflection in one or other of the areas referred to here.

Innovation and the reform process

The **reforms** undertaken in education systems over recent decades or in recent years can be summed up as belonging to **four types**: corrective, modernising, structural or global[45] and this applies to the changes which have taken place in both western Europe and central and eastern Europe.

Sufficient experience has been acquired - often disappointing because of the disparity between aspirations and achievement - to demonstrate that in reality, **the method of formulating and guiding through a reform is at least as important as its content.** The familiar question of whether a reform should be initiated from the top down or vice-versa is really not important; what does matter is the **cooperation** and **interaction** at a sufficiently early stage **between all the partners and those operating the system.**

Among the **necessary conditions** for the success of any reform, the final conference stressed four aspects: **wide political consensus** (which is not only related to a minister's period in office), an **effective information strategy**, the **continuing training of teaching staff** and **permanent evaluation of its implementation.** Change must be desired, provoked, enabled, supervised, consolidated and facilitated[46] and each of these stages requires considerable human, material and financial resources.

However, one decisive element has often been forgotten or underestimated: the **"time factor"**. The time has gone when a reform - whatever its scope - was thought of as a single act, a one-off which needed only to be enacted to produce its effects. Attention today is focused on **the effectiveness of measures taken** and on the **actual change** they bring about. In view of the complexity of education systems, the considerable number of factors of resistance and the rapid changes in knowledge and the surrounding world, no solution can

---

42. Lorentzen, S, "Des enseignants pour un nouveau siècle - La formation des enseignants en Europe: quelques défis présents et futurs à partir d'une analyse des tendances générales de l'éducation et des activités du Conseil de l'Europe", Strasbourg, 1996.

43. Fernandez, J-A., "Education and teachers in western Europe", Geneva, BIE, 1996.

44. see Mudry, A., "Projet et conduite de l'action", in Résonances, Sion (Switzerland), 1996, pp.24-25.

45. see on this subject César Birzea's analysis in the introduction to the symposium on "Educatinal reforms in central and eastern Europe: Processes and outcomes", Prague, October 1995.

46. see de Vries, M.J., Report of the symposium held at La Villette, op.cit.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

be decreed once and for all or considered final. **All reform is necessarily** a long haul, directed towards the medium or long term; so it can only be seen as **a continuing process;** this is a conviction which should be shared by everyone involved, so as to avoid many delays and disappointments.

Finally, as we have already mentioned in the introduction, it can be seen that **significant change** to an education system **cannot be planned in isolation**, and has much wider and deeper implications that is often thought at the outset; so we can see that any genuine reform is complex, multi-faceted and, finally, global; it must, therefore, be planned from a **systemic perspective.**

Comments

- It can be said, without exaggeration, that the issue of innovation and reform has been a current running through all the symposia, so there is something of interest in this connection in all the reports. The particular situation and problems encountered by the countries of eastern and central Europe are given in the reports of the Bialobrzegi symposium (Poland)[47], the Brussels seminar[48] and the Prague symposium[49].

- The global nature of reforms has often been revealed at the symposia and seminars which have taken place throughout the project, as we have already had the occasion to point out in this report. At this point we will simply recall, for example, that a change of content, and reform of the curriculum will necessarily have repercussions on learning and teaching methods and, consequently, on the training of teachers, or that a new distribution of competence and greater autonomy for schools will provoke considerable change in all of the components of the system. Failing to take this into account will lead, at best, to nothing more than "mini-reforms" or, in the worst cases, reforms which serve no useful purpose whatsoever.

- The image of a play (comedy? drama? tragi-comedy?) seems rather appropriate to describe reforms! There is an author, a script, a director and an audience and they all need to be talented for it be a success! However, the most striking thing about this play is that there is no "unity of time" or coincidence: "pedagogical time" does not have the same scope as "policical time" or "economic time". This is particularly well highlighted, in our opinion, by Danièle Blondel: "*Who says reforms frequently end in disappointment? Even if it does not fully answer this question, perhaps we should rethink the interaction between the school and its environment, between the permanence of the goals of education and the dynamics of incessant change in our society. In short, we should think in terms of time (...) there are a number of "times" on different horizons. The longest is the history of nations and societies: education is impregnated with secular traditions (...) the second time, which covers practically a generation in the countries where schooling now extends until adulthood, corresponds to the education system itself. We must therefore think of the system in terms of progress and not in terms of a static ideal at a given moment. This requirement imposes a coherence "dans le temps" between the reforms which it is very difficult to respect. (...) This difficulty is even greater because the third time, the time of those involved, is different again. Teachers, parents and principals need to learn how to implement reform, to understand its objectives, and to translate them into reality. (...) In conclusion, we should not try to impose the rhythm of change of the education system onto the rhythm of change of the disturbances of its environment.*"[50]

- The issue of innovation was also dealt with during the project but has not been studied in detail, either in the national reports or at symposia or seminars. This is principally because, as D Kallen has stressed, the secondary level is much less fertile ground in terms of innovation than compulsory schooling and, secondly, that experiments carried out are still unfortunately largely unpublicised, poorly disseminated and little used. This is equally true at both national and international levels, where there are no real "observatories of innovation". We should point out, on this subject, that an important project is under way to reorient the activities of the International Office for Education in this direction.

---

[47] Leclercq, J-M., Report of the Bialobrzegi symposium, op.cit. (note 1).

[48] Birzea, C., Report of the Brussels seminar (December 1993) on "School legislation: Dialogue on the reforms in Central and Eastern Europe", Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1994.

[49] Cerych, L., Report of the Prague symposium (October 1995) on "Educational reforms in central and Eastern Europe: Processes and outcomes", Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1996.

[50] Blondel, D., "Passé, présent, futur", in Sources UNESCO No 52, Paris, novembre 1993, p.10.

- Allow us to conclude in a rather colourful way. Albert Camus once said: "There are two kinds of effectiveness: the effectiveness of the typhoon or the effectiveness of the sap". Clearly, it is the second kind we are thinking of when we think of educational reform. There is no doubt that we would be well inspired - to maintain the coherence of the image - to apply to reforms what we call the "gardener's strategy". An education system - or, within it, the curriculum - sometimes resembles the tangle of a rather neglected tree: a trunk and one or two main branches, lots of secondary branches and some dead ones, too ... when a nurseryman wants to "re-form" (give back shape) to a tree like this, he begins with drastic pruning. He retains the essential main branches, removes the dead and inward-growing branches which are preventing the sun from penetrating it, and trims the secondary branches. In this way the tree can use all the energy of its sap and develop, better balanced, more harmonious and taking maximum advantage of the light. However, the gardener cannot stop there; he must pay attention to the tree on a regular basis, setting up a sort of permanent maintenance plan, keeping it in check, otherwise after only a few years his efforts will have vanished into thin air ... Is that not an interesting, and perhaps even disturbing, analogy with the idea of reform as a continuous process?

3.4. The European dimension

The two essential aspects of the European dimension have been taken into account throughout the project and also during this conference. The first concerns **the European dimension of education systems themselves**; indeed, even if these are, and remain, the responsibility of each country, it is no longer possible to ignore the reality of education in other European countries. Everything in the report so far demonstrates this: there are problems, but also common trends, synergies to be sought out, converging solutions to be worked out, so as to make systems more permeable, more compatible to permit both greater mobility and better quality. We already have a European educational area; it is continuing to develop and a project such as the one which is coming to an end makes what must be a decisive contribution to this "European dimension of educational policies". The second aspect, which is more specific, concerns the need for education to take account of **the European dimension in terms of values, citizenship, cultural heritage and developing in young people a "European awareness"**, in the curriculum, in content, and in methods and pedagogical activities. It is this second aspect which will be dealt with principally in the following pages.

General comments

"*After this project, it will no longer be possible to think of, let alone practice, the European dimension in the same way we thought necessary before*"! This comment, made by a participant in the corridor, sums up the general feeling rather well. Whether it be the summary report, the pedagogical dossiers, the monographs, the activities on links and exchanges or the Donaueschingen seminars, the participants at the final conference have appreciated the relevance of the analyses, the interest and diversity of pedagogical approaches proposed and the practicality of didactic and documentary tools. They have also highlighted the specific and irreplaceable role of the Council of Europe in this sphere and expressed the wish that the momentum achieved should continue in one form or another.

For over twenty years we have been talking about the European dimension and its importance for education. On numerous occasions the concept has received a genuine political legitimacy, whether at intergovernmental or national level, through resolutions, declarations, recommendations, etc. But in fact, the results of its actual introduction and its general application to schools and classrooms have been somewhat mitigated, despite a whole host of initiatives, often isolated and unfortunately somewhat dispersed. So it was worth undertaking something and that is what motivated the work in general.

As we mentioned at the opening of this conference, the method chosen throughout the project to address the European dimension was - as with all good teaching - inductive and pragmatic. Rather than try to find a theoretical definition of the concept and seek applications for it, we preferred to record experiments, good practice, interrogate teachers and experts, encourage the continuing training of teachers, stimulate the creation a network on links and exchanges and even take the risk of producing some examples of pedagogical resources. And this was how conceptual and pedagogical reflection was fed, formulated, enriched, extended and deepened. The **summary report** is therefore a genuine **reference tool**, indispensable for educational policymakers, curriculum and teaching materials designers, teacher trainers and teachers alike. Obviously we cannot summarise it here, but we will attempt to highlight one or two key elements.

Prospects

In terms of prospects, first of all, it seems that there are at least five dangers to be avoided in creating the European dimension in education:

- **simplification** and **vulgarisation**: the teaching of history, modern languages, religion, Latin/Greek, geography, philosophy, the study of European institutions, etc. does not in itself constitute the European dimension, even though these subjects may have a European content; unfortunately, it is not possible to make the European dimension as Mr Jourdain made prose - unwittingly;

- **dogmatism**, which consists of thinking of Europe as a sort of absolute meta-value, like the alpha and omega of any consideration; the local and national approach remain indispensable because only firm foundations will permit a widening of perspectives; similarly, there is neither reason nor opportunity for a "unified European education system" to become a reality;

- **narrow Eurocentrism**; the values to be promoted are universal and their development leads naturally to taking account of the interdependence and solidarity of Europe vis-à-vis the rest of the world; issues of such importance for the future as the globalisation of the economy, migratory movements or the ecological balance have an increasingly global dimension;

- **short-sighted utilitarianism**, focused mainly on "the training of competitive, highly-competent economic agents in the context of the community or, to put it more cynically, the training of "migratory polyglots" likely to select the best place in Europe for their material success"[51];

---

[51] Jollivet, G., in Actes du colloque "La dimension européenne à l'école" (June 1991), Ecole normale d'Auteuil, Paris, p.3.

- **excessive optimism**, which would not take account of the new and positive opportunities for discovery, exchanges, cooperation and mutual enrichment; the common European values are still under threat: in the west by their vulgarisation, the loss of a sense of responsibility and an excessive individualism, in central and eastern Europe by the difficulties of reconstructing the political and economic system; everywhere, there is the threat of a resurgence of racial conflict, nationalism and xenophobia; the European dimension cannot be taken for granted; it calls for an effort of will, which often comes up against the difficulties of everyday life or "wounds of history" - old or new - which have not yet healed.

The working groups reaffirmed this: **the European dimension cannot allow itself to be wrapped up in** - yet another! - **new discipline**, which would have to be added to an already full curriculum. Obviously content - in terms of civilisation, values, a project for Europe - are very important. But over and above knowledge, it is a **"sense of belonging"** and a **"will to build"** which needs to be fostered and developed. The European dimension is therefore primarily a question of **state of mind**, of mentality, of putting into perspective, of thoughts and feelings which can "break down the barriers in people's minds" so that each European can find his place in this new and very real space, can act and communicate according to the principles of mutual understanding, tolerance, recognition and acceptance. With regard to the European dimension, one can justifiably speak of **the need for an "overview"** which takes in not only the altitude but also the elevation". For example, the European dimension of history is something other than the simple sum of the histories of Germany, France, Poland or Russia; nor is the European dimension of geography the successive study of the geography of the various countries; the European dimension of language learning is not in the knowledge and mastery of the linguistic subtleties of each language; the European dimension of citizenship is not limited to a knowledge of the political systems of European countries or how European institutions function. **It is only by being aware of the interaction and reciprocal influences - both positive and negative - and by taking an open, diversified, pluralistic, tolerant and critical approach that a European vision of reality can be constructed.** Just as with all the questions tackled during the project and referred to during the conference, we are dealing with a necessarily multidimensional and complex perspective: cognitive, affective, cultural, social, civic, pedagogic and didactic. Knowledge and attitudes, scholarship and competencies, theory and practice, content and processes intermingle and enrich one another. Such reflections are not found in theory, abstraction or idealism. The project has shown this to be true: this is possible in our everyday dealings; we can even say "the European dimension exists: we have seen it", within educational institutions themselves!

Strategies

Which strategies appear to be best suited to introducing the European dimension in education? Very briefly, there are a number of key elements which can be highlighted:

- **resolutely supporting the training of teachers and others in education**, starting with initial training. There is a need to motivate them and develop both general and specific competencies to encourage a respect for pluralism and interculturalism, partnership and exchanges (see chapter 4 of the summary report);

- **explicitly including the Europe dimension in study programmes and curricula,** starting at the compulsory education stage. It is not a question of "adding a veneer" of new content, but of using a different approach. Many possibilities exist already: out-of-school options or activities, for example. But it would be a pity to stop there: what we should be aiming for is to make it part of the education of all young people. At this point, the reform of curricula in terms of competencies and key competencies seems to be not only a promising but almost indispensable route towards pedagogical progress;

- **laying emphasis on pedagogical measures and activities which genuinely involve pupils**. We need to move from the cognitive to the educational, from the concept of a "safe education" to the concept of "learning about, with and for Europe". In this context, the pedagogy of the project - whether it be applied in the school itself, as part of a network or constitutes the actual subject of links and exchange activities - is particularly suitable. In a necessarily interdisciplinary project, disciplines lose their fragmented, absolute nature, but above all content and activities acquire meaning: learning languages in order to communicate and succeeding, learning history and geography in order to have a better understanding of the other person's culture, etc. Furthermore, a pedagogical project can be a way of integrating school activities, peri-school activities and out-of-school activities into a coherent whole (see chapter 3 of the summary report);
- **developing appropriate materials**. Although it is true that current teaching programmes and resources already allow many activities to take place, the investment required of teachers to take advantage of this is enormous and we must be realistic if we want to involve more than a committed minority. What we require, then, are specific materials. The project has provided many examples, together with some ideas on how to go about creating them (see chapter 2 of the summary report); however, in addition to fax, the enormous potential of the new information technology ought to be explored;
- **continuing and enriching thinking on the very concept of the European dimension**. Chapter 1 of the summary report takes stock of the position in great detail. But the concept is still evolving and any future experiments will be enable it to be further refined and developed.

In conclusion, it seems that **the satisfactory introduction of the European dimension must go hand in hand with more general measures to improve secondary education as a whole**, which have been discussed at length in this report. In this respect, the European dimension is an **essential component of the educational policy of the future;** even more than that, its genuine inclusion could have the effect of making it **a lever** for a **"global education"** for individuals, on the one hand and a **fundamental pedagogical renewal**, on the other hand. So, the European dimension as a "Trojan horse" within schools? Why not?

3.5. The post-project period

It is clear that the project will not be carried on indefinitely, nor will it maintain itself. However, it is now entering a crucial phase of dissemination of "products" and ideas, a phase during which a number of objectives ought to be pursued: finishing off the work in hand, validating and legitimising it, disseminating and developing it.

– Finishing off the work in hand:

What now needs to be done, as quickly as possible, is to finish off and publish all outstanding papers: national reports, monographs, pedagogical dossiers, summary reports, etc.

– Validation and legitimation of the results:
This is one of the aims of the Kristiansand conference; ministers will study the results and decide on the form of any "legislative" follow-up (Declaration, Resolution, Recommendation, etc);

– Dissemination:

What needs to be done is to put an effective strategy into place, associating the Council of Europe and the Member States. This could take a number of forms:

- publicity and wide distribution of publications to Member States, with the assistance of central authorities, libraries/documentation centres, NGOs, right down to local level, wherever possible;
- use of the Council of Europe internet site;
- translation and publication into languages other than English and French;
- adaptation of a number of publications for a wider and more diversified school public than simply general secondary;
- organisation of national or regional seminars. This is without doubt the best way of ensuring effective dissemination to those genuinely involved in the education system.

– Development and follow-up:

- with regard to **educational policy**, first, consideration of the key problems tackled during the project ought to continue at pan-European level, because such problems are at the very heart of a continuing process of reform. During the conference, several themes were referred to as being of interest for follow-up through an exchange of experiences and joint development, focused in particular on innovation: the management of a system through partnerships, the role of the State and the authorities, the objectives and methods of evaluation (of schools and teachers, in particular), the construction of curricula in terms of competencies and key competencies (common European framework of reference?), the components and methods of evaluating a "common core", school autonomy and school plans, the training and management of human resources, etc. At Kristiansand ministers are expected to provide guidelines and priority themes likely to be form part of the programme of the education committee.
- in terms of **the European dimension**, the summary report[52] contains a number of recommendations, and participants at the final conference stressed their relevance.

---

[52] Summary report on the European dimension, op. cit., pp.118-119.

In addition to the work, already referred to, to be undertaken with a view to achieving a widespread distribution of publications, it is proposed that the follow-up activities for the project be aimed in two directions: the production of teaching materials and continuing education.

With regard to production, given accumulated experience and the needs which have been expressed, it would be desirable that the present "bank of pedagogical resources" (dossiers, monographs) continue to be added to (areas of the programme and interdisciplinary themes which have not yet been addressed, new authors, etc). An "observatory/laboratory" for the European dimension - in a form to be determined - could be created by the Council of Europe; this would be a sort of "task force" or international pilot group of experts, charged with pursuing discussions, producing and experimenting with new pedagogical resources for pupils, a pedagogical guide for teachers and guidelines for authors and publishers. The production of pedagogical resources would thus become a component of the existing service activities of the education committee's programme.

In parallel with this, strong emphasis must be laid on the continued training of teachers, principals, administrators and teacher trainers, either at national level or at international seminars (Donaueschingen, for example).

As Maitland Stobart recalled at the opening of this final conference, all the efforts of this project will have been in vain unless the relevant milieux in the Member States make full use of the knowledge acquired. In this respect, the phase when results are disseminated must be seen as an integral part of the project itself. This is not a simple "wish", or "possibility", but an "obligation to be fulfilled".

IV. BY WAY OF CONCLUSION ...

By and large, the outcome of this final conference is a positive one: it has been an important event, with the wide variety of countries and protagonists in secondary education in Europe well represented; the evaluation of the results of the project has been very positive and the conference will have permitted them to be presented to a wider audience and set in context. Certainly, the project "A secondary education for Europe" was ambitious, but it has been successful. We are sufficiently modest to think that it is now possible to see a more clearly defined outline, the general architecture, the essential components, the requirements and the desirable prospects for the evolution of a secondary education which, as was the project's objective, can seek and achieve the following:

- "to give young people the knowledge, competencies and attitudes that they will need to meet the major challenges of European society;

- to prepare young people for higher education and for mobility, work and daily life in a democratic, multilingual and multicultural Europe;

- to make young people aware of their common cultural heritage and their shared responsibilities as Europeans."

Obviously, we are a long way from describing a sort of "European model" for secondary education. However, important markers have been set down which, while respecting national differences, should inspire and influence educational policy in our countries, facing as they are largely common challenges: quality for all, effectiveness/efficiency, democratic management, the European dimension and citizenship.

For a general rapporteur, to summarise the main results of the project, the richness and variety of the contributions made over the three days of this final conference is not only difficult, but thankless. Under the constraints of brevity, there is a risk of oversimplifying, of omitting important aspects or falling into rather abstract and boring generalities. We are not certain that we have avoided this and appeal to the reader's indulgence.

Moreover, a final conference encompasses a whole host of intangible, unmeasurable elements which are, nonetheless essential: meeting people from all four corners of Europe, exchanging and comparing points of view and experiences, the reinforcing of certain ideas and possibly even renewed enthusiasm to put them into practice; finally, an openness to other cultures, other perspectives and, who knows, the questioning of certainties! Unfortunately, it is impossible to detail all these different aspects, and yet together they constitute one of the riches and characteristics, and the very foundations - in terms of processes rather than just products - of cooperation in educational affairs as we understand it at the Council of Europe.

However we dare to hope that, despite its failings, this report will be of use. In fact, it ought to be seen rather like a "commented restaurant menu" or an "aperitif" of sorts. It would give us enormous satisfaction to think that we had in some way whetted the reader's appetite, encouraging him to "sit down at the table", and "feed" his own thoughts by delving into the riches contained in the documents produced during the course of this project.

ANNEXES

A. Speech by Gabor Halasz: introduction to the 1st part of the works of the group 72

B. Speech by Jean-Michel Leclercq: introduction to the 2d part of the works of the groups 90

C. Presentation of the project – 1991 to 1996 98

D. Programme of the final conference 108

E. List of participants 111

ANNEX A. Speech by Gabor Halasz: Introduction to the 1st part of the works of the group

Before entering a more concrete reflection on the tendencies and challenges in European secondary education, let me raise two compelling preliminary questions. The first is connected with the justification of our new European interest for this area. The second is related to the meaning we give to the notion of secondary education.

I. Why do we deal with secondary education

If we look at the dominant themes of educational publications and conferences of the last one or two decades we probably find that secondary education as a *general topic* was not in the focus of the interest of the international community. After the completion of the great reforms of the sixties and the seventies more attention was given to basic and higher education and vocational training or to such transversal themes as curricula, teacher training, governance or quality. It seems that we are now at the beginning of a renewal of interest for secondary education as institutional sphere or level.

What justification can we find for our new interest for this area?

- The first reason for this new interest is probably that sufficient time has gone since the great reforms which led to the massification of the lower cycle of secondary education and made it part of general basic education in most countries. This allows and requires evaluation and makes it necessary the search for new perspectives for development.
- The second reason might be found in the current process of generalisation of upper secondary education. This raises a number of questions which are, in many respect, similar to those that had been raised earlier by the generalisation of the lower secondary level but they are far from being identical. The whole problematic of the relationship between general education and work or vocational training has to be rethought, as well as the contents and the methods of teaching an increasingly heterogeneous population.
- The third justification might be connected to a particular European development, namely to the emergence of the European political union which, I think, necessarily leads to the widening of European level competencies in the field of education. The most convincing sign of this development is the appearance of a new Union competence for general education besides the old competence for vocational training in the Maastricht Treaty. This certainly is encouraging the community of European countries to start a common reflection on the different spheres of general education, including the secondary level. In this reflection all European countries are interested, including those which are formally associated with the EU or which want to have a closer co-operation with the Union.
- Finally, a fourth factor is probably connected with the political transformation in Central and Easter Europe which led to the questioning of many aspects of social life, including

educational structures and contents. This resulted in the fading of the earlier boundaries between different educational levels and also in the questioning of the basic objectives of the different types of institutions. These are being now socially re-negotiated. A debate on secondary education is logical in this context.

We could certainly find other justifications, as well, but this is probably enough for persuading us that what we are doing at this conference and what we have been doing in the framework of the Secondary Education for Europe programme of the Council of Europe had to be done and has to be continued.

Those who followed the seminars of the last five years can confirm that an extremely rich and fruitful reflection has developed on the challenges secondary education is facing in our days and on the possible strategies for coping with these challenges. And this, I think, provides a further, *a posteriori*, justification for a European level reflection on this issue. The richness this reflection produced could come only from contrasting the rich experiences of all European countries.

II. What does secondary education mean

The second question concerns the definition of the area. There is no time and space here to enter into those details which appear, for instance, in the elaboration and the upgrading of the International Standard Classification of Educational Systems (ISCED). I only would like to evoke a few distinctions that should be borne in mind when thinking about what we mean by secondary education.

1. *Two ways to define secondary education*

The first distinction can be made between secondary education as education provided for a *certain age group*, on the one hand, and as education leading to certain types of *certificates or qualifications*, on the other.

1.1 Secondary education as education of a given age group

According to the first meaning we understand by secondary education those schools or courses which normally enrol pupils from the age of 11 or 13 to the age of 18 or 19 or pupils attending certain grades. If we use the first meaning we tend to treat as secondary all types of education that are delivered to pupils beyond a certain normal age independently of the school type they attend. They may, for instance, attend apprentice schools which traditionally are not defined as secondary institutions.

1.2 Secondary education as education of a given level

On the other side, if we follow the second meaning we have to include into the category every course or programme that leads to a certificate or qualification defined as being of secondary level. We have to do so even in they are attended by adults or if they are delivered in the less institutionalised forms of distance and open learning. In principle, an also in fact, even higher education institutions can deliver secondary level courses.

1.3 Why is definition important

Both definitions necessarily generate further debates. The acceptance of any of them have serious consequences on our thinking. In case of the first meaning one has decide beyond what age or grade a pupil enter the secondary level and the age or grade beyond which he or she is already at the tertiary level. This can be naturally different from country to country. In case of the second meaning the level of the individual programmes or courses, that is the level of the qualification they lead to has to be defined. It is evident that no universal criteria are available for this purpose.

2. *General and vocational education*

The other distinction we have to think of when reflecting on secondary education is between general education and vocational training. We all know how difficult is to draw their boundaries partly simply because they overlap each other, and partly because they themselves do not have clear borderlines. The question of where general education ends and where vocational training starts could never be answered, for instance, in the European Union, although the Union has different legally defined roles in these respective areas. Recently, with the growing interest of education and training policy in operationalizing life-long education, including open and company based forms of learning the questions of delimitation is raised again.

3. *Rigid definitions do not work*

All these questions draw our attention to the fact, then when reflecting on the field we cannot use static notions. The consensus on what we include into the category and what we do not is more difficult to reach today that a few decades ago when the traditional definition of secondary education was - at least within a country - more or less the same for everybody. Today no policies for secondary education can be devised without reflecting in a dynamic and open way on these issues.

III. Tendencies and challenges

When analysing trends and challenges I think it is necessary to bear in mind continuously both shorter and longer term perspectives. Although thinking about the future of secondary education we have to focus our attention to the questions of longer term development we cannot neglect those most alarming social and economic problems which are currently encountered by European countries and which have serious implications for secondary education. All the more so that many of these problems can be solved only if the longer term perspectives are taken into account. Let me start briefly with pointing to some of the most alarming current problems.

1. *Alarming current problems*

1.1 Enduring economic crisis

Since the middle of the seventies Europe has been living in the conditions of a lasting economic crisis. Today it is generally accepted that the nature of the present crisis is different from those well known cyclical ups and downs that necessarily characterise any market led production. This is a structural crisis which requires structural adaptation.

The crisis has been particularly deep in Central and Eastern Europe where the incapacity of the adaptation of economies and societies led to the collapse of the ruling political regimes at the end of the eighties. The countries of the region have inherited a rigid economy with companies protected from competition for several decades. They inherited a work force with a relatively high level general education but with very little adaptive capacity and culture for undertake or for self-employment. And finally they inherited highly developed and expensive systems of social benefits and security.

One of the most important consequences of the crisis is the lack of resources for funding public services, including education, at an appropriate level.

1.2 Unemployment

The second problem - which would be mentioned by many at the first place - is related to the first one: this is unemployment. Many analysers would probably agree that this is the most alarming challenge and the greatest threat European societies currently face. This problem has recently been profoundly analysed at level of the European Union in the White Paper on „*Growth, competitiveness and employment*" issued in 1993 by the Commission of the EU.

Within the Union more than 17 million people are out of work. The White Paper states that the only solution would be the creation of new jobs and that these could be generated only by economic growth. As it is written in the document "the European Union should aim to create 15 million jobs by the end of the century". But the real message of this white paper is that *economic growth cannot be generated on the basis of existing trades and industries but only if new, more competitive industries, based on a high level technology and highly skilled labour are created.*

The picture is certainly darker if we include the countries of Eastern and Central Europe. Although the economy of most countries of the region is already producing growth this came after four, five or even more years of steep decline. Today certain countries show a spectacular dynamism but this characterises only a few sectors while, others do not show the needed capacities of adaptation. Furthermore, growth and dynamism is often based not on technological development and real investment, but on short term beneficial circumstances like large scale privatisation, cheap workforce, undemanding markets or favourable regulations.

The greatest short term challenge for the economies of both Western and Eastern Europe is how far they will be able to improve the competitiveness of their industry and trade and how far their labour force can adapt itself to the emerging new needs. If adaptation is the key word education has certainly to play a major role.

1.3 Weakening social cohesion

Another alarming problem our European societies are facing - and naturally this is strongly linked with the problem of economic crisis and unemployment - is the weakening of social cohesion. The enduring unemployment of a large proportion of the population, including young people is not only the inevitable consequence of economic crisis but also a sign of the decrease of social solidarity. In a society characterised by growing competitiveness there are inevitably losers and winners But the gap between the poor and the rich is bigger today than two decades ago and the number of people living in very bad conditions is increasing.

The growth of social inequalities is particularly strong in Central and Eastern Europe where, after decades of egalitarianism, an increasing part of the population is living in the conditions of poverty and deprivation. It is paradoxical that poverty and deprivation appears in a context of high relative level public spending on social benefits, and a level of deficit of public budgets which does not allow further growth of this type of spending.

It is certainly not independent from these that many manifestations of violence and intolerance have made their appearance in Europe during the last decade. Social exclusion, nationalism and ethnic prejudices have again become a serious concern in Europe. These have led to violent conflicts in some parts of Central and Eastern Europe where the political vacuum created by the collapse of the Soviet system aggravated the situation. Keeping the social peace and preserving the peace between nations has become more difficult than it was a decade ago.

The White Paper of the European Union, I mentioned earlier, although it concentrates on growth and competitiveness also strongly stresses the need for greater social cohesion and solidarity. It is clear that without this no sustainable economic growth can be imagined. Education has certainly a major role in achieving social cohesion and solidarity in a world necessarily characterised by growing competition, individualism and increasing inequalities.

1.4 Fading belief in the democratic institutions

The weakening of social cohesion is accompanied also by the fading of the belief in the democratic institutions. There are many signs showing that an increasing number of people in Europe have lost their belief that the institutions of parliamentary democracy can solve the current problems of society. In some Western European countries a growing number of people give their votes to political parties that are openly against the model of free market and democracy which emerged after the Second World War and which has produced prosperity for many decades.

The attractiveness of non-democratic solutions is particularly high for those people in Central and Eastern Europe who have never enjoyed the benefits of market freedom and political democracy and who - against their optimistic expectations - are often living in worse conditions since these have been restored. This again has serious educational implications.

2. *Older problems to be rethought*

Besides the most alarming acute social and economic problems some other problems and rends which are related more directly to education also have to be analysed.

2.1 The expansion of secondary education

The major trend that characterised the development of secondary education during the last decades and which is probably the source of the most significant challenges is *the quantitative expansion of the system*. By the seventies, or often earlier, the lower cycle of secondary education became general in most European countries. Since then we have witnessed the continuation of expansion also at the upper level. Some countries formulated this as an explicit policy goal, others have let the process go on without explicitly supporting it. The demographic conditions are, in many countries, particularly favourable for such a development: with the decreasing number of children a higher enrolment ratio can be achieved without increasing enrolment in absolute terms.

According to OECD data 95% of the 15 year old and 89% of the 16 year old pupils were in secondary schools in the European Community in 1992 which was close to the OECD average. The same data for the 17 and the 18 year old cohort was 78% and 48%, respectively, but here the variation is already very high with 55% for the UK and 93% for Belgium for the 17 year old group.[1]

The challenges that arise from the quantitative expansion of the system are well known. Let me mention only some of the main questions that our countries will have to answer:

- should we support the further expansion at the upper secondary level or should we hold it back;

---

[1] Calculated on the basis of data from Education at a glance, OECD, 1995

- if support is given to expansion what kind of new institutional forms are needed and what combination between these and the traditional forms has to be assured;
- if expansion goes on, who and how should cover its costs; what share should the public purse, the individuals, the economic companies and the other stakeholders have;
- if expansion goes on and the size of the system increases what kind of adaptations will be necessary in order to assure effective management, financing and quality improvement;
- what level of unity do we expect the system has to have at upper secondary level; how can the system meet the huge variety of social needs; and how the appropriate balance between equity and social justice, on the one hand, and efficiency and relevance, on the other hand, can be assured.

Many of these questions are similar to those that had been raised when the generalisation of the lower secondary level took place. It is evident, however, that they cannot be answered in the same way as they were two decades ago. The social and economic conditions of our days are very different from those which characterised the former expansion period. We have to take into account our current social and economic problems. These problems are, certainly, not exactly the same in the more and less developed parts of Europe. It will, therefore, be necessary to give a special attention to the specific problems of the countries of the Central and Eastern European region.

2.2 The weakening role of families

The problem of weakening social cohesion which was mentioned earlier as one of the short term concerns is partly linked with the phenomenon that is often quoted as the breakdown of the family. Family statistics show the decrease of the number of marriage by inhabitants and the parallel increase of divorces. In the more developed regions of Europe every third marriage ends by divorce and in certain countries the divorce rate is higher 40%. This is a tendency which is common to the western and eastern parts of Europe. Another important phenomenon, which appeared first following the forced industrialisation in the East then later in the West is the increase of women participation in labour. By the end of the eighties this was around 50% in Southern Europe and 80% in the Nordic countries. Although the proportion of working women has been decreasing since the late eighties in Central and Eastern Europe it is still very high.[2]

All this means that the role of the family in the social integration of individuals is necessarily decreasing and it is partly transferred to the school. The tasks related to socialisation and social integration are present not only at primary or lower secondary level, but also at the level of the upper secondary school.

3. *Developmental perspectives*

After evoking some of the most alarming problems of our societies and economies and some current trends let me turn *now to the future and to the developmental perspectives*. We cannot forget that those who attend secondary schools today will live and work in the twenty first century. When thinking about the education of children who enter the school system in the coming years we have to bear in mind that they will be still in work and they will be active members of society after 2050. It is therefore indispensable that we give serious consideration to the changes which are expected to influence life and work in the approaching new century. Given the well known rapidity of technological change we can naturally have only very vague images.

---

[2] T. Husén, A Tuijnman & W. D. Halls (ed.), Schooling in modern European Society - A report to the Academia Europea. Pergamon Press, 1992. 108-124.p.

3.1 The changes of the work-place

A major task of secondary education is and certainly will remain the preparation of young people for work. It is therefore essential that we try to analyse the changes which will probably affect the world of work.

These changes have been analysed in many reports published by various national and international agencies. Let me quote now the report published in 1987 by a commission led by Jacque Lesourne in France which listed a number of features that will probably characterise workplaces in the future, at last in competitive organisations. Let me repeat a few of them here:

- decision-making will be decentralised with only the strategic functions being kept in the centre;
- the organisational hierarchy will become flatter with a decrease of decision-making levels and with the transfer of responsibility to the units which directly deal with the clients;
- the organisational structure of companies will become more flexible and the reliance on the dynamism and the initiatives of personnel will increase; autonomy at all level will be reinforced;
- organisational structures will be frequently changed in order to help adaptation to a changing environment;
- the forms of employment will become more flexible in order to allow the organisation to adapt itself to the fluctuations of demand;
- organisational success becomes more important than the formal distribution of responsibilities;
- the co-operation between the members of the organisation will be encouraged in order to make organisational reactions more rapid;
- the personnel will be demanded to participate more actively in the direction of the organisation;
- salaries will depend more on real achievements then on formal promotion

3.2 Changing higher education

Preparing pupils for higher studies traditionally has been and will always be one the most important tasks of secondary education. It is therefore natural, that the development of higher education has direct repercussions on secondary education or that changes of the first are challenges for the second. What are those major changes in higher education that have to be mentioned in this context? I would mention the following:[3]

- In many countries higher education has become a mass system enrolling almost one third or sometimes more of the relevant age groups. Entering higher education in these countries does not mean any more a direct way to well paid and secure jobs.

- Parallel to massification higher education has become highly differentiated, as for levels and types of specialisation. Besides the traditional university an expanding sector of non-university higher education is emerging which is in general professionally oriented. In general the vocational orientation of higher education is being strengthened.

- Besides the universities and the non university types of higher education institutions there is an expanding sector of post-secondary education. This sector which gives an opportunity for further studies and professional specialisation for many students leaving secondary schools is often directed by the market. Post-secondary courses may be organised in secondary institutions, as well.

- Although the responsibility of the individual for planning his or her own studies has ever characterised higher education, with the introduction of flexible credit systems the importance of individual responsibility is increasing. It may happen that a person collects credits in several institutions in different times. It becomes therefore more and more difficult for students to organise their individual way through the complexity of courses.

- With the growing fragmentation of study fields and the increasing number of specialities the responsibility for finding wholeness and integrity falls more and more on the individual student.

- Higher education in has become highly internationalised. This means that the probability for a student to pass part of his study time abroad or to listen regularly to lectures delivered by foreign professors becomes always higher.

3.3 Information society

Our society is more and more frequently called information society. Information and communication technologies has already changed our life and work and they will cause further changes. If somebody had told us two decades ago that people will have dozens of TV channels in their home, that they will communicate walking in the street with their partners living in another town or that they will read sitting in their homes documents in libraries of other countries we probably would have thought that this is pure fantasy. But this is reality today

Information and communication technology allows global communication which is already a reality in many classrooms. The report of the commission Delors prepared for the UNESCO and published this year also calls our attention to this reality.

> "Les nouvelles technologies ont fait entrer l'humanité dans l'ere de la communication universelle; an abolissant la distance, elle concure puissament a faconner les sociétés de demain, qui ne répondront, a cause d'elles, a aucun modele du passé. Les informations les plus précises et les plus actuelles peuvent etre mises a la disposition de n'importe qui a la

---

[3] See for instance: Higher Education. The Lessons of Experience. A World Bank Publication. 1994

surface du globe, souvent en temps réel, et atteignent des régions les plus reculées. Bientot l'interactivité permettra non seulement d'emettre et de recevoir des informations, mais aussi de dialoguer, de discuter et de transmettre des informations et des connaissances sans limites de distance ou de temps opératoir" [4]

The impact of information and communication technology on work and therefore on educational needs has recently been analyzed in a Green Paper of the Commission of the European Union as well. The document says as follows:

> „One of the main effects of new ICTs has been a dramatic reduction in the cost and time of storing, processing and transmitting information. Such dramatic changes in price relations have a fundamental effect on the way we organise the production and distribution of goods and services and, thereby, on work itself. These developments are reshaping work, skill structures and the organisation of enterprises. Through this, they are bringing fundamental change to the labour market, and to society as a whole. The resultant shifts in the structure of skills, work patterns, companies, and goods and services is bewildering, and makes very different and new demands on workers and employers. Static function-based skills, and traditional management models and techniques, are rendered inadequate and inflexible in a workplace which demands the opposite of workers and managers - the development of a new industrial and enterprise culture characterised by flexibility, trust, commitment and ability to anticipate and harness change."[5]

3.4 Life-long learning

A further theme is connected with the place and time where education and the development of human resources can actually take place. This is first of all naturally in the formal school system working with pupils of normal schooling age. But this is also outside the formal school system in different forms of training in different institutional settings.

The reflection about the possible educational answers to lasting massive unemployment, to the related need for greater adaptability, to the expected changes in the world of work, and especially to the rapidity of these changes logically lead us to the notion of life-long education. The relevant activities of OECD or the EU all lead to the conclusion that life-long learning is one of the appropriate educational answers to these challenges. It is not by chance that the ministerial level meeting of the Education Committee of OECD in last January devoted its time entirely to this question. It is either not by chance that the EU decided to make 1996 the year of life-long and open learning. The question we have to raise here is this: what are the implications of life-long learning for secondary education and what role secondary education could and should play in an open world of life-long learning.

Life-long learning is more than a simple slogan. This notion came to the focus of interest of educational thinkers at the end of the sixties when the reflection on the educational consequences of rapid technological changes was given an impetus. This interest was raised again in the early nineties in a different context and with a different accent. It was raised mainly by those studies, like for instance the Job Study of OECD, which tried to understand the causes of lasting and massive unemployment and to suggest solutions. The major conclusions of these studies is, I think, that in the future we cannot expect that economic recovery stop massive unemployment as it did in the past. Economic growth will play a part in reducing unemployment. But - I quote the introduction of the OCED Job Study - „beyond the cyclical component of unemployment is a structural element that persist even into recovery. This is harder to reduce and is even more troubling". [6] This study formulates a strong criticism toward the OECD countries: „Policies and systems have made economies rigid, and stalled the ability and even willingness to adapt." If this is true for the OECD countries it is even more true for Europe. The already mentioned White Paper of the European Commission on "Growth, competitiveness and employment" which was published one year before the OECD Job Study has came to the same conclusions.

---

[4] Lesourne, Jacque: Education & Société. Les Défis de l'An 2000. La découvert - Le Monde de l'Education. 1988. 154.p.

[5] Green Paper: Living and working in the information society: people first. European Commission. 1996

These pilot studies did not stop at the level of diagnosis and criticism but went further into the direction of concrete policies. Most of the proposed policies are directed to allow more flexible forms of employment through making labour market regulations more flexible. But many of them are directed to develop certain capacities, skills and competencies in working people that is to factors linked with education. If the messages of these documents are taken seriously our European societies will have to face pervasive changes. It is logical that education is expected to help the needed adaptation. It is therefore important that teachers and education policy-makers understand not only the need for this adaptation but also its nature.

Among the many possible challenges this means for education, let me mention only two. The first is that adults, with a wide variety of educational needs, will appear in an increasing number among the clients of education. The other is that the skills and competencies that our pupils will need for succeed in the transforming labour market and changing work organisations will be different of those they needed in the past.

In what sense do adults wishing or obliged to learn represent a challenge for secondary education? Let me refer here back to what I said earlier about the definition of secondary education. If secondary education includes all secondary level teaching independently of whether they are given to children or adults and independently of the place they are delivered we necessarily have to deal with the question of teaching adults also in the context of secondary education.

Adult courses can be offered by secondary schools and by the normal teaching personnel of these schools. I think it is necessary that we clarify our relationship to this practice. The appearance of learning adults in the school, which is a typical current phenomena in a number of countries, is a serious challenge. This can happen in a form which deteriorates the organisational conditions of schools. Sometimes it happens that teachers who are attracted by the better paying adult courses devote too much energy and time to these courses and less to the normal pupils. But this can also be a stimulating new task for secondary schools encouraging them to renew their teaching practices, to introduce methodological innovations and to make their teaching more relevant.

3.5 We have to be cautious concerning developmental needs

It is important to stress that many of the changes and challenges we mentioned will probably affect our life and work in a very uneven way. While some sectors or domains of life will be transformed at an extremely accelerated pace others will remain practically untouched by changes. We shall probably live in the next century in a society characterised by the coexistence of traditional, modern and post-modern forms of life and work. While stressing the importance of modernity and technological development we cannot neglect traditions and those domains of life that remain regulated by them.

---

[6] The OECD Job Study. Facts. Analysis. Strategies. OECD 1994

4. *Particular challenges faced by Eastern and Central European countries*

The social and economic problems and therefore the challenges that secondary education faces in the countries Central and Eastern Europe, despite of many similarities, are not the same as those in Western European countries. We have already mentioned some features characterising the special conditions of Central and Eastern Europe. Let us now add some others.

An important feature worth being mentioned here is the generally high educational level of the young population in Central and Eastern Europe. But, paradoxically, the real knowledge and skills behind this high level education are often inappropriate from the point of view of economic development and sound social life. Although the great majority of school leavers have vocational qualifications, which could be a great advantage, most of them have qualifications linked with shrinking sectors or jobs without perspectives. This is why - contrary to most Western countries - in many Central and Eastern European countries the proportion of the unemployed is higher among those who have vocational qualifications than among those who have made general studies.

A further feature to be mentioned here is the particular fragility of the democratic institutions. The reasons of this fragility are well known: the restoration of democracy has been accompanied for too many people by the deterioration of life conditions; the conflicts between the parliamentary parties are often too violent; the capacity of the political system to tackle ethnic and national conflicts is often too low and political apathy characterises a too large part of the population. In Central and Eastern Europe schools have to teach and educate pupils in this particular context and education policy has to define its priorities facing these particular challenges.

5. *Redefining teaching and learning objectives*

All the current and expected changes and tendencies that we have been so far mentioned are logically drawing our attention to the following question: how the objectives and the content of secondary education should be defined if we want that secondary education transmit relevant knowledge and skills to individuals living and working in Europe in the coming decades. Or, to put it in another way, what are the competencies that European individuals and societies need in the near future and what role secondary education should play in developing them.

5.1 New competencies for European individuals and societies

I cannot make a detailed reference to all the prospective competencies that are needed by our European societies. The „Secondary education for Europe" project has devoted a whole symposium to this.[7] Let me just mention a few that, I think, merit special attention.

- *Humanistic and scientific knowledge and traditional values.* European secondary schools are traditionally strong in transmitting sound humanistic and scientific knowledge. Our secondary schools are especially good in developing historical awareness, literariness, artistic taste, mathematical-analytical skills and knowledge of natural sciences. These are valuable qualities that have to be preserved. It is logical and understandable that when analysing the major trends and challenges European secondary education faces we concentrate on our most urgent problems. This should not hinder us to pay attention to the traditional and unquestionable tasks of secondary education, that is to transmit the general values of our culture:

---

[7] Jean-Francois Perret, Introductory notes to the Symposium on "Key Competencies for Europe", Bern, Switzerland, 27-30 March 1996

- *New competencies for the new jobs.* If what we said about the transformation of the world of work and the challenges of the information society is true our pupils will need new competencies if they want to live and, especially, to be employable in the society of the next century. The relevant competencies are often listed: co-operative skills, communicative abilities, the capability to organise one's work autonomously, problem solving, creativity, being able to work in conditions of uncertainty etc. We have to raise the question here: how far our secondary schools are oriented towards the development of these capacities.

- *Capacity to use the new information technologies.* The use of modern information technologies becomes indispensable not only in work but also in our everyday life. The capability to use them becomes as important for life as the capacity to read was during the past two centuries. The development of this capacity is now started at the level of primary education but it has to be continued at secondary level, as well.

- *Capacity to learn.* If the rapidity of technological development is accelerated and if this will have the expected impact on jobs, our pupils' capacity to keep their jobs or to find a new one will depend mainly on their capacity to learn. The capacity to learn during the whole life is therefore a major competence to be developed by or secondary schools.

- *Building solidarity.* If competitiveness will become stronger and if, as it is expected, the gap between the rich and the poor will widen, social peace can be kept only if our children are able to build and maintain solidarity. The development of this capacity has to be in the focus of our secondary schools.

- *Protecting democracy and open society.* The fading belief in the democratic institutions and the always re-emerging dangers of extremism and fundamentalism that threaten our European societies make extremely important the development of those individual and social competencies that are needed for making the democratic institutions work properly.

- *Building a European identity* The peoples who decided to become the member of the community of European nations have also decided to develop a common identity. This common identity is even more needed if Europe is to be a community of citizens and not only that of countries or nations. Our secondary schools have a natural role in the difficult and delicate tasks of developing a new European identity in our pupils.

- *Living in a multilingual society* Living in Europe means living in a multilingual society. This means much more than knowing foreign languages. In a multilingual Europe people speaking different native languages will have to analyse problems, elaborate plans for actions and assess their results together. They will have to face situations of emergency requiring rapid action and to solve conflicts. A new competence will have to be developed: working together efficiently in a multilingual context.

- *Moral and mental integrity.* The psychological and moral burdens our modern societies put on the individual are well known. With the growing complexity and openness of our societies and with the growing pace of change these will certainly be even heavier in the coming future. Secondary schools have always had a special responsibility for the moral and mental development of youth. They take care of young people in an age which is perhaps the most crucial for the moral and psychological development of the individual. They have to help our pupils to keep their integrity in a world characterised by increasing complexity, rapid change, uncertainty and unpredictability.

- *Protecting our physical environment.* Everybody knows the dangers threatening our physical environment and the outstanding importance of environment awareness. And yet, this still does not have the role it should have in the educational work of many secondary schools. Changing the attitude of young people towards environment is a common European responsibility and secondary education has a major task here.

5.2 The role of secondary education in achieving the goals

We have enumerated a number of competencies our secondary schools should develop and a number of educational tasks they should fulfil if they want to answer the challenges of the rapidly approaching next century. There are, however, two important further remarks that have to be made here.

The first remark is that the possibilities of schools in developing all the mentioned competencies and capacities are limited. Besides the schools there are other important educational actors which often are more influential than the schools. The existence of alternative educational actors, especially the media and the leisure industry, is a major challenge to school education in the next century.

The second remark is also connected to the role of educating actors outside the school system. Schools cannot monopolise learning. Many important forms of learning and competence building are realised outside the formal school. This is why an important educational tendency of our days is the encouragement of the different forms of open learning. This leads even to attempts to create new techniques for the formal recognition of the alternative paths to knowledge. Recently the idea to create a European Personal Skills Card which could accredit skills acquired by people outside the school system was put forward be the EU Commission.[8]

6. *Adapting the mechanisms of government*

One of the current trends that influence the development of secondary education is the redistribution of responsibilities. This is a complex phenomena which is the most frequently referred to as decentralisation.

6.1 Decentralisation as a broader social-political issue

Decentralisation is a dominant tendency in all over Western Europe, the relevance of which is far beyond education. As it is put forward by the already quoted EU White Paper on ,,Growth, competitiveness and employment" there is a general need for decentralisation and reliance on local and individual initiatives. "Decentralisation - says the document - reflects a radical change in the organisation of our societies, which are all confronted with the growing complexity of economic and social phenomena and the legislative or regulatory framework." If society and economy goes towards decentralisation and local autonomy with all the difficulties of social co-ordination and regulation this involve, education can certainly not go to the opposite direction.

---

[8] Presentation of the European Year of Lifelong Learning by Mrs Edith CRESSON. Edinburgh. 22.Feb.96. Ref.: SPEECH/96/47

Decentralisation and increasing school level autonomy became an important goal in most Central and Eastern European countries, as well, after the change of political regimes. But, in most countries this reflected much more a natural and spontaneous reaction of teachers and the their professional leaders to the totalitarian past then a well founded long-term policy. The foundations of the policy of decentralisation seem to be better elaborated in the more developed countries of Western Europe.

6.2 What is to be rethought in connection with decentralisation

It is perhaps not superfluous to mention a few concrete questions that has to be thought over if decentralisation continues to be a major policy goal:

- Decentralisation is much more than simple power devolution to lower levels or the simple reduction of the power of the centre. It is in fact the redefinition of the roles of the different government levels with new responsibilities and competencies assigned to each of them;
- Decentralisation does not mean the passivity of the central government and neither does it mean the abolition of control. It means new mechanisms of control based on new forms of quality assurance which - as it is put in a recent OECD publication on school evaluation - is based on „target setting and monitoring rather than ensuring compliance";[9]
- Decentralisation requires competence building at those lower levels where new responsibilities appear; it also requires new support structures and mechanisms;
- Decentralisation and school autonomy are two different things which do not necessarily go together, decentralisation without greater school autonomy and without the active supporting role of the centre can lead to more conservatism and more reluctance to change;
- School and local autonomy is incomplete without a greater role to be given to the users, the clients of the schools; it is important to widen their possibilities to choose and to form an opinion. The aim is not simply to give more power to teachers but to make the system more adaptive.

6.3 Assuring quality and effectiveness

For a number of years a major preoccupation of education policy in European countries has been to find better ways for assuring quality and effectiveness. As we already referred to it both the further expansion of secondary education and the increase of local and school level autonomy has made it necessary to rethink this issue. Almost all European countries have put the question of quality improvement on top of their education policy agenda.

---

[9] Schools under scrutiny. OECD CERI. 1995. p. 27.

Two major policy instruments are used for improving quality. The first is *evaluation* which is generally understood in a broader sense, including the assessment of student achievement, the evaluation of individual schools and that of the whole educational system. This issue has been in the focus of educational policy since the mid seventies in all over Western Europe and it became a central concern in most Central and Eastern European countries following the political transformation.[10]

The second major instrument is *management development*. Research has showed that effectiveness and quality depends strongly on the quality of school level management. In many countries a number of measures have been taken for developing this factor, especially through introducing different forms of management training. The quality of system level management has also received attention through for instance the training of higher rank educational officers (European support is used partly for this purpose for example in Poland). New management tools of quality assurance like school level project building, regular self-evaluation or public reporting to clients are also used more and more frequently.

Quality and effectiveness will certainly remain a central concern for education policy in Europe. There is a growing interest in sharing experiences or in developing common instruments in this area. I can imagine, for instance, that the need for a European level common assessment of learning performances of pupils will appear in the near future. The rich experiences of many European nations, the work done during several decades in IEA, the recent initiatives of OECD in the INES networks or the past and current activities of EURYDICE give a good starting point to this.

IV. A secondary school for Europe

The development of the European community and the creation of the political Union prove that the move towards a higher level cultural and political integration, even if it is, by nature, very slow and long, is inevitable. We all know that the creation of a common Europe is a delicate cultural, intellectual and educational task. If Europe is to be the Europe of people and not simply the Europe of products, regulations and subventions schools have to find their role in this process of creation.

As the resolution adopted by the ministers of the European community on the European dimension in education in May 1988 formulated, the goal is "to strengthen in young people a sense of European identity", to prepare them "to take part in the economic and social development of the Community", to "make them aware of the advantage which the community represents, but also of the challenges it involves", and to „improve their knowledge of the Community and its member states"[11] This is an extremely complex and difficult task if direct methods putting further burdens on pupils and having necessarily a reverse effect are to be avoided. But, at the same time, this is also an attractive and challenging task opening new perspectives and new educational opportunities.

---

[10] See for instance the Czech policy paper „Quality and Accountability" (Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport, Prague, October, 1994) or the Slovenian „White Paper on Education" (Ministry of Education and Sport, Ljubjana, September 1996)

[11]. Resolution of the Council and the Ministers of Education Meeting within the Council on the European dimension in education of 24. May 1988 (88/C 177/02)

V. Getting the job done

The world of institutional education has never gone through so deep and big changes in such a short period than during the last one or two decades. But these changes are still slower than those of the social and economic context of education. A tremendous amount of creative work has been done in order to better understand the current social and economic transformation and their educational implications. I hope I do not exaggerate if I say that this led to a real renewal of our educational thinking. This intellectual achievement has produced radically new notions and approaches which, I think, proves of the vitality and adaptive capacity of our continent. However, real adaptation happens only if the new ideas become operational and change the practical reality.

John Coolaghan, in his paper presented last Spring at the seminar on Key Competencies for Europe in Bern has rightly quoted Trostén Husén who warned us on the deepening gap between "goal rhetoric" and the reality of schools. I can only repeat what John Coolaghan said in this paper: "There may be much to be gained at this time from a consolidating approach whereby international bodies could harvest what is valuable from the existing research, development and reflection which have taken place with regard to the secondary school in modern society."[12]

I think there is no need to explain how difficult is to give an overall picture on the main trends that characterise secondary education in contemporary Europe and the major challenges it faces. I do not think I could wholly achieve this too ambitious task. I hope, nevertheless that these introductory remarks could provide at least a starting point for discussion.

---

[12] John Coolaghan. Competencies and knowledge. Council of Europe. Paper presented at the Symposium on "Key Competencies for Europe". Bern. Switzerland. 27-30 March 1996.

ANNEX B. Speech by Jean-Michel Leclercq: Introduction to the 2^d part of the works of the groups

I have been asked to present the second series of questions for consideration by the working groups.

These questions on the theme of "Prospects and strategies" raise problems different from those posed by the first series, although they are clearly a logical follow-up to them. With the first series you considered in which directions the aims and objectives of secondary education should be reoriented to take account of the new circumstances that have to be faced. It is now a question of examining the organisational and operating solutions that will enable the most appropriate, efficient reaction to this changed situation. However, although we will thus turn our gaze from the present to the future, the two viewpoints are of course inseparable. Firstly, the present lays the foundations for the achievements of the future. Secondly, and above all, failure to define the measures to be taken to ensure the effectiveness of future action would leave us with a series of considerations which might be praised for their relevance, but could at the same time be criticised as being unlikely to bring any results. This shows how decisive this second stage in our proceedings will be in giving full scope to the Project and this Final Conference.

To this end it is necessary that we reason on two levels, as was the case in the first working groups but here even more so. The first level is that of the large amount of information gathered in the course of the Project, and the second the conclusions to be drawn from this information for the reorganisation of secondary education in Europe, a reorganisation which can be seen to be necessary on so many counts. If the two levels could not be combined this Final Conference would be in danger of having confined itself to a mere stock-taking, with the risk of becoming rapidly outdated, or having attempted to open up new avenues that would prove disappointing because the need to follow them would not be sufficiently evident. It is in fact necessary that they be justified by all the discussions held, all the questions raised and all the contributions made in the past few years.

I felt it was appropriate to introduce the second stage in our proceedings from this angle. My approach will therefore mainly consist in attempting to demonstrate the validity of the questions submitted to you, since by showing them to be legitimate we will indeed acknowledge the far-reaching changes needed in the way we envisage the problems inherent in the organisation and functioning of secondary education. Naturally, it is by updating our grasp of these problems so we can tackle them as they henceforth should be tackled that we stand the best chance of proposing the most convincing solutions.

I. Structures

This approach is already borne out if one considers educational structures.

The inventory made during the Project, in particular in the "Guide to secondary education in Europe", shows that the issues are no longer exactly the same as those involved in the initial choice of structures.

In lower secondary education, the single curriculum and streaming are now hardly ever perceived as directly opposed, irreconcilable solutions. It is true that, in terms of the number of countries that have opted for such a system and the number of pupils concerned, the single curriculum dominates lower secondary education to a large extent. However, opinions have changed as to the benefits that can be expected from it and the form it should be given. Although a single curriculum is often still considered desirable to avoid jeopardising equality of opportunity from the outset, it is no longer regarded as a panacea. In particular it is no longer perceived as a springboard for a more democratic society. Consequently, although they remain opposed to the idea of offering different paths through school, its proponents have gradually tempered their ambition of imposing absolutely the same curricula on all pupils. As for the streamed systems, in their case an increasing effort has been made to make curricula more alike, at least in the first years, in order to avoid creating too permanent divisions at too early a stage. The supporters of the two solutions are once more able to communicate on the same wavelength since some factors, such as recognition of the difficulty of dealing with non-uniform classes, of the diversity of pupils' abilities and interests or of the degree of independence which schools should be allowed so that they are no longer mere cogs in the machinery, devoid of any identity, are universal. As a result the current tendency is to ask not whether a fundamental choice must be made between the single curriculum and streaming but what degree of standardisation is desirable at the lower secondary level. The answer is of course one that would make it possible to reconcile two needs, the need for all pupils to be kept together until the end of their compulsory schooling so that they are guaranteed a basic education that is sufficiently common to all for them not to be split into groups separated by the nature and objectives of their studies, and the need for school careers that afford each pupil the best opportunity of self-fulfilment and success, instead of the single educational mould which we thought, or pretended we thought, was the solution. But is there any need to say that the changes that should therefore be envisaged still raise thorny questions, with which you will inevitably be confronted.

Conversely, upper secondary education would seem to be destined to differentiate between pupils. As can be seen from the documentation gathered in the course of the Project, whether it gives preference to academic curricula, as a prelude to higher education, or it is assigned a more multi-purpose function encompassing vocational and technological courses, upper secondary education systematically offers a wide range of options, and sometimes even specialisations. Their existence can easily be justified as a response to the diverse needs of both young people and society. Moreover, there is no shortage of moves to broaden the range of upper secondary education along these lines.

Yet, one cannot help wondering whether it is possible for upper secondary education to continue unendingly multiplying the possibilities it offers without laying itself open to serious difficulties that are not only administrative or financial in nature. Despite greater decentralisation, it is undoubtedly difficult to accept the idea of a system that would become increasingly multi-facetted in order to satisfy uncontrolled growth in demand. The financial cost of full-scale diversification can unquestionably be regarded as unbearable, above all today when the available resources are shrinking. However, other considerations clearly carry as much weight. The end of secondary schooling is now no more than a half-way stage, before the pupil sets out on another often ill-defined educational itinerary. It would therefore be dangerous if those who arrived at that stage were equipped in such a way that too many possibilities were ruled out in advance. Furthermore, because of the growing numbers of pupils in upper secondary education, this risk must be avoided while they are still at school by facilitating the reorientation of those who have made one or more wrong choices. Lastly, is there any need to point out that it is increasingly inconceivable that a field of study or activity can be properly approached without a broader range of knowledge than that acquired through narrow specialisation? In this respect, an excessive increase in the number of possible itineraries could but be harmful. It would give the impression that freedom of choice was being promoted, whereas for many pupils it would in fact lead to a dead end.

It is therefore necessary to seek a compromise, bearing some comparison to that which seems to be needed at the lower secondary level, although not in completely identical terms.

Educational structures therefore do offer us an initial example of the new problems brought to light by the Project and the new decisions it prompts us to make.

It is also easy to be persuaded of this when considering questions such as the consistency to be achieved between the various structures, or the links to be envisaged between general education and vocational or technological training.

With regard to the consistency to be ensured, the Project first convinces us of the need for such consistency by reminding us of the many obstacles facing today's young people in making steady progress rather than scrambling haphazardly up through the levels of their compulsory or post-compulsory education, and in finding themselves before a range of possibilities rather than on a set course determined by their past record. The Project then leads us to aspire to something more than mere structural consistency, which would be confined to providing points at which pupils could be allowed to either continue on the same track or be shunted in another direction and would leave the system's structures strung together in a disconnected fashion. We therefore cannot fail to perceive the advantages of a more internal consistency, intended to ensure that pupils steadily acquire a range of abilities throughout their schooling. The stages in the school system would then no longer correspond to a series of levels organised in a hierarchy of irreconcilable alternatives but to different versions of the same requirements.

It is also obvious that there is a great need for such consistency in order to avoid vocational training's being pushed outside the mainstream and devalued in comparison with general education. Vocational training courses are very often made to appear as separate parts of the secondary education system through the way in which the training centres themselves are designated and the qualifications to which they lead. Whether in terms of the skills they aim to inculcate or the population they cater for, they encounter serious difficulties in attaining recognition as courses on the same level as general secondary education. These are the inevitable consequences of an inadequate quest for, or even a lack of interest in, consistency. It would be worth asking ourselves if in such circumstances efforts to promote vocational courses are not doomed in advance. If they are to be truly successful it should be possible to base those efforts on more extensive, more convincing integration and interconnection of vocational training and secondary school education, no matter what role is assigned to the business world.

II. System management and partnership

Another subject we are asked to consider is management of school systems and of schools themselves. We shall also be taking account of the far-reaching changes that have taken place in this field, which we had many occasions to note in the course of the Project.

The symposium held in Bialobrzegi in 1992 and the seminar in Brussels in 1993 made it possible to gauge the extent of these changes and to observe that it was not just the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, following their break with the authoritarianism of the pre-1989 period, that were affected.

It can be seen, in particular, that the distinction between centralised and decentralised systems is now scarcely valid. Almost everywhere central government powers are being shared with local authorities, and schools are being allowed greater administrative, financial and educational freedom. Moreover, parents, socio-economic agents and, increasingly, pupils are represented and have a say at all levels.

School systems thus increasingly differ from the single-track model which almost always served as a reference when they were first set up. They have become multi-track. They are tending to form groups of networks identifiable in terms of the supervisory authorities with direct responsibility for them and the initiatives taken by the schools themselves. Development of exchanges of teachers and pupils on a European and even a worldwide scale and the introduction of the European dimension, which is taking place in many different forms, can but intensify this phenomenon.

This increase in the number of decision-making centres changes the balance of power or, rather, of powers. Authority, at no matter what level, can no longer consist in issuing regulations and ensuring they are applied, as if checking a copy against an original. The measures implemented must be agreed with the parties concerned, and must always leave them a degree of discretion. Otherwise, those measures will be at risk of having a merely superficial effect and thus being ignored or circumvented in the long run.

The questions on this subject indeed reflect all the consequences of this new situation, since they leave room for conclusions to be drawn in respect of the transfer of responsibilities, power-sharing, partnership and the roles to be conferred on the various partners. They also have the merit of raising a very important issue, that of the need to succeed in reconciling centripetal forces with centrifugal ones, freedom with efficiency, and diversity with unity. Therefore, hopefully one of the main results of our discussions on this subject will be that they succeed in pinpointing the nature of the decisions to be taken and the means of implementation to be recommended, so that a balance is struck between the guidelines to be observed and the desirable flexibility in their application. This is not an easy task, but it is an essential one if we are to progress beyond management methods which are clearly no longer in tune with reality or suited to our needs, and if we are to resist the temptation of impractical, unrealistic solutions.

III. Teaching content and methods

This subject brings us to another area where the Project shed much light on the situation while at the same time underlining the seriousness of certain difficulties and pointing to possible ways out of them.

The symposium held in Porsgrunn in 1993 drew attention, above all, to the efforts that are still needed in order to ensure that curricula, and the teaching approaches adopted as a result, do not give the impression of being spurious alternatives for an unattainable ideal. It was also very relevantly pointed out that disparities in this area are even more harmful today than they were in the past. Most young people's chances of success in secondary education would seem to depend on factors such as institutional links between subjects, truly integrated curricula and a less theoretical, more practical approach to knowledge.

The symposium held in Bern in 1996 had the merit of bringing to the fore the advantages to be derived from focusing on command of know-how and skills. This would involve revising our ideas about the purposes and processes of learning. Firstly, theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge would no longer be considered as two completely different spheres, and this would no doubt be a means of at last making secondary education fundamentally democratic and establishing the absolutely essential link between general education and vocational training. Secondly, the actual construction of the curricula would change for the better. Skills are necessarily cross-curricular. By giving priority to the acquisition of skills, the different subjects would be considered outright as related, complementary fields and no longer as departure points in a difficult unification process. Instead of being an objective desired with varying degrees of sincerity and achieved only at rare, exceptional moments, the integrated curriculum would be the foundation on which we built. The subject matter to be learned would be decided according to clearly identified needs, and haphazard amassing of knowledge would be avoided. Lastly, it is probable that closer links would be established between research and education. The means of building and acquiring knowledge, behavioural skills and know-how would become the central focus of the education process, and there would be a natural inducement to try to benefit from research in this field. This would apply in particular to the entire range of cognitive sciences, failure to make better use of which has rightly been a cause for astonishment for many years.

Admittedly, when the ingredients are known but the directions for use are lacking the formula cannot work miracles. However, this conference is a particularly good opportunity to heighten our awareness of the fact that teaching content and methods are so often unsuitable and to identify the new horizons we should be aiming at in carrying out the necessary reforms.

It is not certain that in the limited time available to us we will be able to do anything more than adopt a number of elementary decisions. However, if they were firm enough to affect the future, they would be a significant step forward.

IV. Assessment

The questionnaire naturally also pays due attention to the problems raised by assessment. However, it can once again be assumed that it is based on observations, which we are asked to build upon.

At the Birmingham symposium in 1996 the many reasons for wanting to assess the results of systems, schools and pupils were listed. Recognition was also given to the difficulties to be overcome if assessments are to contribute what is expected of them. Their aim is always to provide information on the degree of administrative or teaching efficiency attained. However, there is a risk that the measurements will be too superficial where we rely solely on quantifiable aspects, or that all objective criteria will be abandoned where we intend to concentrate on the qualitative aspects.

If the two approaches are not combined the assessments themselves and above all the use made of them are likely to be biased. Efficiency will be gauged solely in terms of performance and, for example, instead of schools and teaching staff emulating each other, thereby stimulating their capacity for initiative and innovation, the outcome will be a competition similar to some forms of commercial rivalry.

If, as is to be hoped, secondary education embraces the main ideas that emerge from the Project, such slippage would be extremely detrimental to a proper analysis of the results it has achieved. Proficiency will be more complex to assess than attainment of levels of knowledge. It will be necessary to cover a broader range, and the achievements will be less immediately obvious.

Therefore, as the wording of the questions moreover indicates, our discussions should focus less on the need for assessment, which is now widely acknowledged, than on its aims and methods. This being the case, we can hardly avoid having to define or redefine what we mean by efficiency. It is difficult to see how we can otherwise guard against illusions and misunderstandings concerning the reliability of assessments, no matter what methods are used. As to the methods to be preferred, the choice will unquestionably also not be an easy one since it will be a matter of envisaging all the approaches that are likely to be a source of enlightenment without necessarily being mathematically precise.

From this point of view it would undoubtedly be useful to reconsider the advantages that can be expected from international co-operation. Such co-operation has so far centred on a comparison of the resources made available for education and the results obtained, mainly in terms of pupils' performances. However, it should also be expected to allow exchanges of views that shed more light on the aims and methods of an assessment carried out at all the desirable levels.

As was the case with teaching content and methods, this subject should therefore provide us with an opportunity to recommend guidelines for addressing concerns which, although they are not new, are constantly growing in importance.

V. Human resources

The same applies to the expected reactions on the subject of human resources.

The title itself, which mirrors that of the seminar held in Estoril in 1996, reveals a concern to change the way in which the contribution of education personnel is envisaged, in order to overcome problems that were recognised many years ago, in particular the lack of communication and interaction in educational circles, which are highly compartmentalised. It is self-evident that these shortcomings will increasingly hamper the proper functioning of secondary education. As we have seen on many occasions, to function properly it requires, among other things, close co-operation between teachers of different subjects and effective interaction between teaching and non-teaching staff. It was for this reason that the Estoril seminar focused on the composition of educational teams and their management from the human resources angle, which was perceived as the best means of satisfying the need for unity and dynamism.

Taking a human resources management approach, even if it has to be different from that prevailing in the business world, would naturally have many consequences in terms of the contributions required of staff. They would be expected to meet new standards of professionalism, and this could not fail to affect their status and careers.

It can be seen that the problems broached here will not be directly bound up with teacher training issues, which it did not appear relevant to include in the Project because they are frequently dealt with elsewhere. The sole exception was the symposium held in Paris in 1994, which was devoted to science and technology teachers, who seemed to deserve special attention. Our only concern will be to examine how teachers could be better prepared, before and after taking up their duties, to assume a role in more closely knit teams, where communication and relationship skills in respect of other team members and the educational community are likely to become just as important as teaching ability.

These are of course highly sensitive subjects which must be tackled with a sense of moderation and in a spirit of consultation, without which there can be no foreseeable solution. But everything goes to show that a solution absolutely must be found. The prospects of giving the 21st century's secondary education system the staff it so badly needs, and the personnel's chances of securing recognition for their valuable, irreplaceable role, hang on it.

In this respect our discussions can be expected to be of dual benefit: firstly, by opening up an essential field of work and, secondly, by identifying, with all due caution, the action required in that field.

VI. Innovation and reform processes

In drawing up the questionnaire and referring back to the symposiums and seminars that led to the choice of questions, we had many occasions to note the innovations and reform processes with which they are connected. Today's reforms are perhaps less spectacular than those of the sixties or seventies and may give the impression that instead of sweeping changes the present preference is for small, ad hoc adjustments. However, taken together, they are nevertheless designed to bring about in-depth changes in the way people function and behave.

It is therefore likely that what we are witnessing is not so much a decline in ambitions but rather a tendency to pay greater attention to the effectiveness of reform measures. The meetings in Bialobrzegi, Brussels and Prague revealed a great deal in this respect. Their leitmotif was that the way in which reforms are carried out is just as important, if not more so, than the objectives pursued.

There is no lack of references to these ideas in the questions before us, which focus on the prospects of success of different kinds of reform and the strategies and management techniques that they make possible.

At this juncture I merely have a number of comments on what, in my opinion, is involved in the concept of reform as an ongoing process, since I believe this determines the nature of the reforms that can be envisaged and their foreseeable impact.

The history of education is rife with reforms of reforms, and these are readily regarded as proof that the initial decisions were inappropriate or ineffective. It is true that many hurriedly conceived or ill-judged projects are open to this criticism. Yet, for all that, it must not be forgotten that, on account of their complexity and the impact of certain unpredictable factors, educational problems scarcely lend themselves to once-and-for-all solutions. It therefore remains for us to accept the idea that the responses will necessarily be partial and provisional in nature, without fearing that this may be perceived as a sign of powerlessness to confront and solve them properly. On the contrary, this is our best possible guarantee of keeping in touch with the ups and downs of reality, rather than clinging on to certainties that distract us from it. A good example is that of curricula, which must, or should, be regularly revised to take account of changing knowledge and teaching methods and the reactions of teachers and pupils, failing which they will become illusory, misleading frameworks. If they are considered an ongoing process, innovation and reforms will not only be more certain to take hold, because they will have long-term effects, but both those in charge of them and those applying them will acquire a maturity, which is all the more necessary in secondary education because of the high stakes involved.

May I simply add that I hope my arguments will not be interpreted as an attempt to influence our discussions, but rather as a desire to ensure that we do not overlook some essential issues.

VI. The European dimension

This at last brings us to the European dimension, a subject which again overlaps the earlier questions so that we have to refer back to them in order to grasp its full implications and persuade ourselves that there is scope for more resolute action.

The question of introducing a European dimension into secondary education has been open for many years at the level of both the European Union and the Council of Europe. However, despite a frequently professed desire to introduce such a dimension, we still have good reason to ask ourselves what will be the outcome in terms of effective action. The studies made in connection with the project's second theme frequently showed the gulf that lies between what is said and what is done.

However, those studies also buttressed all the arguments in favour of including a European dimension not only in curricula, but also in extracurricular activities, above all from the point of view of the Council of Europe. By bringing in such a European dimension it would be possible to open up and improve information and behaviour, thereby enabling the advent of a civil, social and cultural area, in which knowledge of and respect for others would prevail and a sense of identity could be created without ruling out feelings of belonging to a wider community. It would also afford us an opportunity to give new impetus to educational reform by promoting integration of curricula and encouraging people to conceive and implement projects. In sum, it is the European dimension that would enable secondary education to live up to its objectives by taking the most suitable measures to guarantee young people the skills they cannot do without if they are to be truly at home in Europe and all over the world.

It will therefore come as no surprise to you that the questions submitted here call for responses such as to enable progress in these directions, dare I say at last.

This is an indication of how important our proposals will be in ensuring that the European dimension finds acceptance in secondary education and that failure to act and equivocation, of which there has been no shortage, become a thing of the past.

Let us hope that these proposals will carry conviction as an indication of the urgent need to revise both subject matter and curricula in order to give them a true European dimension, that this dimension will shape the tendency of extracurricular activities, that teachers and heads, having been made aware of what this dimension is and what it entails, will be trained in putting it into practice, and that the member States and the Council of Europe will give these initiatives the necessary backing.

These are the comments I wished to make. Their relevance can only be assessed in the light of the quality of our discussions and their conclusions. However, I am aware how hazardous is the exercise I have just undertaken. By over-generalising I would have failed to give you any guidance. If I had attempted to get to the heart of matters, I could have been taken to task for wanting to both ask the questions and give the answers. I must admit that I have often not been able to resist the temptation of pointing to what would be the right answers. But, in the instant case, these cannot consist in single, imposed solutions. Is this a clever excuse for having too clearly pointed you in certain directions, or was that an acceptable option in view of the Project's achievements? I leave you to judge. I only hope that I have not been too boring.

ANNEX C. Presentation of the project – 1991 to 1996

1. Origins and aims of the Project

At its meeting in January 1990, the CDCC decided, on the basis of a feasibility study submitted by the Secretariat and in response to Assembly Recommendation No. 1111 (89) on *The European dimension of education*, to call a meeting of experts to discuss the launching of a secondary education project. Meeting on 31 May and 1 June 1990, the experts concluded:

- that a project of this kind dealing with a part of the education system to which all our countries gave high priority was both feasible and necessary. There were serious problems of structure and content in secondary education, and intensive co-operation at European level might well produce outline solutions which could, of course, be adapted to the various national situations;
- that it was necessary to get this project off the ground quickly by holding a first symposium to define its conceptual framework and decide on planning.

The experts' conclusions were submitted and their main lines adopted at the CDCC's 58th Session (June 1990).

A symposium to launch the project was organised in co-operation with the French-speaking community of Belgium in Brussels (November 1991).

The summary report proposed a single project comprising two themes:

- a general theme concerned with the problems of secondary education in Europe;
- a specific theme concerned with bringing the European dimension into curricula.

On this basis, the Education Committee decided to implement a project, *Secondary education for Europe*, with the following aims:

- to provide young people with the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to meet the major challenges of European society;
- to prepare young people for higher education, mobility, work and everyday life in a democratic, multilingual and multicultural Europe;
- to make young people aware of their common cultural heritage and their joint responsibilities as Europeans.

The European Ministers of Education devoted their 17th Session (Vienna - October 1991) to *TheEuropean dimension of Education: Teaching and curriculum content*. Resolution No. 1 highlighted the political significance of this issue. During their 18th Session, held in Madrid (March 1994), the Ministers decided to examine the results of the project at their future Session which will be held in Norway in June 1997.

2. Description of the project: methods – results

Working methods

Reflecting the proposal that the project be centred on two themes, general and specific, two complementary approaches were adopted.

Concerning the general theme and in order to secure a general picture of the main problems before considering possible solutions, the best method in the Council of Europe context proved to be the holding of a series of **symposia** dealing in turn with the various themes.

In view of the changes which Europe's education systems have undergone in the last twenty years, it was also decided that a **guide** containing a brief and coherent description of secondary education in all the states which had signed the Cultural Convention would be useful.

Concerning the specific theme, the aim was to consider practical ways of bringing the European dimension into curricula and also into extracurricular and out-of-school activities. Three methods were selected:

a. the publication of **monographs** describing practical experiments at present under way or examples of themes or subjects of study which highlight the European dimension;

b. the preparation of **teaching aids** (the educational material programme on the European dimension) for direct classroom use by teachers;

c. setting up a **network** of national correspondents responsible for school links and exchanges.

The Committee, took the decision to set up a restricted Project group, with the intention to begin discussions and synthesis work prior to the final reports and the Final Conference.

The Project Group (see appendix) met six times.

3. Implementation of the project

General theme

a. *Symposia/Seminars*

The following ones took place:

- *Aims and objectives of secondary education*, held in Paris (France) from 10 to 12 June 1992; symposium
- *The school in the local community: autonomy and responsibility*, held in Kassel (Germany) from 5 to 7 October 1992; symposium

- *Democratisation and reform of secondary education in Central and Eastern Europe*, held in Bialobrzegi (Poland) from 12 to 14 November 1992; symposium

- *Contents and methods in secondary education*, held in Porsgrunn (Norway) from 18 to 21 October 1993; symposium

- *School legislation: dialogue on the reforms in Central and Eastern Europe*, held in Brussels (Belgium) from 13 to 15 December 1993; seminar

- *Science and technology teacher training: what training for what type of teaching?*, held in Paris (France) from 30 March to 1st April 1994; symposium

- *Pupil assessment, school evaluation and policy development*, held in Birmingham (United Kingdom) from 15 to 17 March 1995; symposium

- *Educational reforms in Central and Eastern Europe: processes and outcomes*, held in Prague (Czech Republic) from 4 to 7 October 1995; symposium

- *Key competencies in Europe*, held in Berne (Switzerland) from 28 to 30 March 1996; symposium

- *The development of human resources for secondary education in Europe: teachers and non-teaching staff - today and tomorrow*, held in Estoril (Portugal) from 30 May to 1 June 1996; seminar

b. Guide to secondary education in Europe

Once the basic decision to compile this information tool had been taken, there were two desiderata:

- the national descriptions had to be concise enough to keep the guide manageable, in spite of the growing number of signatory states of the Cultural Convention;

- the descriptions had to be comparable, so that differences and similarities between the systems could be easily highlighted;

To ensure the scientific quality and consistency of the whole, the Secretariat set up a select ad hoc group of recognised experts in this field.

Mr Denis Kallen agreed to act as general co-ordinator and to write the analysis grid which was distributed to the national correpondents appointed by the delegations.

Specific theme

a. *Teaching material for the European dimension (ex-Atlas of the European dimension)*

The aim of the teaching material was to answer the question often asked by teachers and teacher trainers: "What can we do, in practical terms, to bring the European dimension into education?".

A starting point was provided here by the atlas of the European dimension produced by the French-speaking community in Belgium in 1990, which was circulated to the members of the Education Committee in 1991.

It became clear that the increase in the number of member countries would soon make a single volume on the Belgian pattern too unwieldy.

An opposite approach was accordingly adopted: educational dossiers of limited length (35-40 pages), each focusing on a specific theme of obvious European interest, and trying to show the different approaches and strategies which can be adopted in dealing with it.

It seemed necessary in fact to provide material which teachers could use directly in the classroom.

An ad hoc group of experts was set up to prepare the ex-Atlas, and Mr Raymond Ryba agreed to act as general co-ordinator and to draft the guidelines for authors and contributors incorporating the main points of the recommendations.

Each dossier is comprised of three sections: a documentary section (map, table, photo, diagram), an editorial section, and a section containing tips and guidelines for teachers.

The experts thought that, as they are produced, the dossiers should have been tested and evaluated in a number of pilot classes or schools (one or two per member country to stay within reasonable limits). For pratical reasons this was not always possible.

The following dossiers were commissioned on the following themes:

- *Environmental damage in Europe - Air pollution*
- *Europeans on the move*
- *The Industrial Revolution: birth of a European technological area*
- *Human rights in Europe*
- *Conflicts in Europe*
- *Discoveries and encounters?*
- *Guidelines for presenting the French Revolution from a European standpoint*
- *Computer data base on the economy of the CDCC's member states*

- *Greek drama and its influence on European literature and ideas*
- *Civic education*
- *Gypsies in Europe*
- *Introducing media in Europe*
- *How to prevent xenophobia, racism and antisemitism in order to build a democratic, multilingual et multicultural Europe*
- *Identity, solidarity and development of a new Europe*
- *The Santiago de Compostela pilgrim routes – a pan-European route*

In the context of the European teachers seminars which take place every year at the Donaueschingen Academy, two sessions were held, one in October 1993 (in English), the other in June 1994 (in French) on the development of educational resources for teaching the European dimension at school, under the supervision of Mr Raymond Ryba.

b. Monographs

From the very start of the programme on the "European dimension pedagogical material", it was clear that producing teaching aids would necessarily be a complex and fairly lengthy process. It seemed, too, that teachers might also want information which was more easily available and intended, not for direct classroom use, but as a basis for reflection in planning curricula or setting up out-of-school activities.

A rapid survey of governments carried out by the Secretariat showed that a very large number of highly interesting extra-curricula or out-of-school experiments were already under way.

It was therefore agreed that details of experiments covering introduction of the European dimension into schools would be published in short, consolidated monographs. Each monograph comprises two sections, the first describing the experiment, and the second containing a discussion of methods and an evaluation.

There are at present monographs on the following experiments:

- *European clubs*
- *Teaching about exchanges*
- *The Fax! programme*
- *The Ozone Project*
- *The Baltic Sea Project*
- *Talking about Europe to young people*

- *Links and exchanges for mutual understanding in a multicultural society*, Switzerland, October 1995;

- *Cultural diversity, conflict and co-operation*, Croatia, September 1996.

The network established three guidelines for further work:

- the promotion of links and exchanges through lifelong learning for teachers, particularly, the development of a training strategy that in both structured and flexible;

- the development of practical aids, both as regards "model" exchanges and thematic modules for schools, and the system support to be given in the search for other schools;

- an analysis of school curricula as regards education for tolerance and for human rights, and the subsequent publication of a collection of examples of good practice in this area.

In 1993 was published *School links and exchanges in Europe: a practical guide* – the updated version will be published in 1996. Furthermore, a newsletter entitled *Links* was launched. There will be two issues a year, and it will be a real working tool for all experts in the field of school exchanges.

The training of teachers, which is indispensable it exchanges are to be productive, remains one of the major concerns of the network. A working group in charge of drafting a training module on teaching for exchanges met in June 1993 in Strasbourg. Continued in 1994, the work was finalised in 1995 and will lead to the publication *Framework for teachers training*.

On the basis of this work, an experimental seminar on the training to school links and exchanges was organised in Austria (May 1994), followed by a seminar in Hungary (November 1994) where participants went deeper into the question. An evaluation seminar was held in Desenzano del Garda, Italy (October 1995).

Furthermore, the multilateral pilot project, which was prepared in 1994, began in autumn 1995. The activity, entitled *Visions of Europe*, involved eight schools, of which six are non-European, in a project which combined the artistic and historical approaches. A training seminar for the project's teachers leaders took place in Colle Val d'Elsa, Italy, in December 1995. The participants, both teachers and pupils, spent a week undertaking common work projects at the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg in June 1996.

The activities of the Council of Europe in the field of school exchanges was given, in March 1994 the support of the European Ministers of Education, during their 18th Session held in Madrid, adopted a resolution on *The promotion of school links and exchanges in Europe*.

- *Villette classes*
- *A European network for geography teaching*
- *The European dimension in the curricula – a Swiss experience*
- *The European dimension in regional exchanges – an experience between United Kingdom and Spain*
- *The European dimension by an inter-regional partnership – experience of the Bade-Wurttenberg Land*
- *The European Awards Scheme in United Kingdom*

It was also found that the authors contacted by the Secretariat had developed an interesting approach to the European dimension in connection with specific themes. It was felt that they could usefully be asked to summarise their ideas, which are incorporated in a second series of monographs:

- *Teaching about society, passing on values – Elementary law in civic education*
- *Dostoyevsky and Europe*
- *The new face of Europe*
- *Minorities in Central and Eastern Europe*
- *Gypsies in the European literature*
- *Teaching about the Holocaust*

School links and exchanges

School links and exchanges are the third element in this part of the project. The activities in this field have taken a larger scale than planned when the project was set up.

The first meeting was held in November 1991 in the United Kingdom. During this meeting the network on school links and exchanges was constituted. Since, the network has constantly enlarged and has worked on different topics:

- *An intercultural training approach to school links and exchanges*, Italy, July 1992;
- *School exchanges as a factor in curriculum organisation*, Norway, September 1992;
- *Electronic school links*, Sweden, October 1993;
- *School links with cultural content*, Poland, September 1994;

Council of Europe In-service training programme for teachers

A special effort has been made to focus courses at the Donaueschingen seminars on themes directly connected with the European dimension of secondary education, e.g.:

In 1991:
- *The teaching of European literature in upper secondary education*, from 13 to 18 May
- *The European dimension in geography: one level among others*, from 3 to 8 June
- *The European dimension of environmental education in secondary schools*, from 14 to 19 October
- *New approaches to history teaching in secondary education*, from 4 to 9 November

In 1992:
- *Project-based teaching: the pluridisciplinary approach to the European dimension in secondary education*, from 18 to 23 May
- *The educational theory and practice of school links and exchanges*, from 22 to 27 June
- *Civic education: teaching about society and the transmission of values*, from 12 to 17 October
- *East-West: building bridges between teachers*, from 9 to 14 November

In 1993:
- *Media education in secondary schools in Europe*, from 10 to 15 May
- *Citizenship education in secondary education*, from 14 to 19 June
- *Educational resources for teaching about Europe in schools*, from 11 to 16 October
- *Problems of history teaching in post-communist societies*, from 22 to 27 November

In 1994:
- *Education and tolerance in multicultural groups*, from 2 to 7 May
- *Educational resources for teaching about Europe in schools*, from 13 to 18 June
- *Studying religions in social sciences at school*, from 24 to 29 October
- *The Danube: a European cultural route*, from 21 to 26 November

In 1995:
- *European dimension and training for the service insdustries in the technical and vocational education*, from 8 to 13 May
- *The school in the fight against intolerance and xenophobia*, from 19 to 24 June
- *The European heritage classes, a way of understanding cultures*, from 6 to 11 November

In 1996:
- *Teaching about history of Europe in the 20th century: approaches, resources and problems*, from 6 to 11 May
- *Education on Human Rights and democratic citizenship: an essential component of the European dimension*, from 10 to 15 June
- *The school in the fight against intolerance and xenophobia*, from 14 to 18 October
- *European dimension and intercultural co-operation in the classroom*, from 11 to 16 November 1996

ANNEX D. Programme of the final conference

• MONDAY 2 DECEMBER 1996

9.00 Registration of the participants: **entrance Hall of the Council of Europe**

Plenary sessions: Room 9

10.00 **Opening Session of the Final Conference**

Speeches by:

- Mr Ivan PILIP, Minister of Education, Youth and Sport, Czech Republic
- Mr Peter LEUPRECHT, Deputy General Secretary of the Council of Europe
- Mr Maitland STOBART, Deputy Director of Education, Culture and Sport, Head of the Education Department, Council of Europe

11.00 *Break*

11.30 **Presentation of the Project "*A secondary education for Europe*"**

- Mr Pierre LUISONI, Chair of the Project Group and General Rapporteur
- Mr Denis KALLEN, General Co-ordinator of the Guide to Secondary Education in Europe
- Mr Raymond RYBA, General Co-ordinator of the European Dimension Pedagogical Material Programme

13.00 *Lunch*

Plenary sessions: Room 9

15.00 **Introduction to Theme 1**: *Trends and challenges*
Aims and objectives of secondary education faced with the complexity of:

- social demands
- quality requirements
- values
- the European dimension

by: Mr Gabor HALASZ, National Institute of Public Education, Budapest, Hungary

16.00 *Break*

Meeting rooms

16.30 **Working groups on Theme 1** – Rooms 14, 15 (Ground Floor), 2, 3, 4 and 8 (2nd Floor) Council of Europe

18.00 *End of the first day's work*

18.30 *Vin d'honneur* – Restaurant of the *Palais de l'Europe*

• TUESDAY 3 DECEMBER 1996

Meeting rooms

9.30 **Continuation of the working groups on Theme 1** – Rooms 14, 15 (Ground Floor), 2, 3, 4 and 8 (2nd Floor) Council of Europe

11.00 *Break*

11.30 **Continuation of the working groups on Theme 1** – Rooms 14, 15 (Ground Floor), 2, 3, 4 and 8 (2nd Floor) Council of Europe

13.00 *Lunch*

Plenary sessions: Room 9

15.00 **Presentation of the reports of the working groups on Theme 1** by the rapporteurs

16.00 *Break*

16.30 **Speech** by: Mr Jaak AAVIKSOO, Minister of Education, Estonia

17.00 **Introduction to Theme 2**: ***Prospects and strategies***

- structures, management of systems and partnerships
- teaching contents and methods
- pupil assessment, evaluation of schools and educational policies
- human resources
- innovation and reform processes
- the European dimension

by: Mr Jean-Michel LECLERCQ, Member of the Project Group "A secondary education for Europe"

18.00 *End of the second day's work*

• WEDNESDAY 4 DECEMBER 1996

Meeting rooms

9.30 **Working group on Theme 2** – Rooms 14, 15 (Ground Floor), 2, 3, 4 and 8 (2nd Floor) Council of Europe

11.00 *Break*

11.30 **Continuation of the working groups on Theme 2** – Rooms 14, 15 (Ground Floor), 2, 3, 4 and 8 (2nd Floor) Council of Europe

13.00 *Lunch*

Meeting rooms

15.00 **Continuation of the working groups on Theme 2** – Rooms 14, 15 (Ground Floor), 2, 3, 4 and 8 (2nd Floor) Council of Europe

16.00 *Break*

Plenary sessions: Room 9

17.00 **Presentation of the reports of the working groups on Theme 2** by the rapporteurs

18.00 *End of the third day's work*

• THURSDAY 5 DECEMBER 1996

Plenary sessions: Room 9

9.30 **Panel** on *The European dimension*

Chaired by: Mrs Ana BENAVENTE, Secretary of State, Ministry of Education, Portugal

Members of the Panel:

- Mr Jan KOUCKÝ, Member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
- Mr Mil JUNG, *Conseiller de Gouvernement 1ère classe*, Ministry of National Education and Professional Training, Luxembourg

Authors of the European dimension report:

- Mr Dominique BARTHELEMY, Deputy Counsellor, Ministry of Education, Research and Training, Bruxelles, Belgium
- Mr César BÎRZEA, Director of Institute for Educational Sciences, Bucharest, Romania
- Mr Jean-Michel LECLERCQ, Member of Project Group "A secondary education for Europe"
- Mr Raymond RYBA, General Co-ordinator of the European Dimension Pedagogicals

11.00 *Break*

11.30 **Presentation of the resultats and conclusions** by:

- Mr Pierre LUISONI, General Rapporteur
- Mr Raymond WEBER, Director of Education, Culture and Sport, Council of Europe

Discussion

13.00 *End of the Conference*

ANNEX E. List of participants

• CHAIRS

M. Pierre LUISONI, *Président du Groupe de Projet*, Délégué aux Affaires internationales, Conférence suisse des Directeurs cantonaux de l'Instruction publique (CDIP), Zähringstrasse 25, Case postale 5975, CH - 3001 BERNE
Tel: 41-31-309.51.23 Fax: 41-31-309.51.50

M. Jaak AAVIKSOO, Minister of Education, Ministry of Education, 9/11 Tönismägi Str., Tallinn, ESTONIA
Tel: 372.6.28.22.39 Fax: 372.6.31.12.13
or/ou 372.6.22.30.00

M. Domingos FERNANDES, Directeur du Département de l'Enseignement secondaire, Av. Junho, 24, 138-6°, P-1350 LISBOA
Tel: 351-1-60.61.26 Fax: 351-1-397.40.42

• CHAIR AND GENERAL RAPPORTEUR

M. Pierre LUISONI, *Président du Groupe de Projet*, Délégué aux Affaires internationales, Conférence suisse des Directeurs cantonaux de l'Instruction publique (CDIP), Zähringstrasse 25, Case postale 5975, CH-3001 BERNE
Tel: 41-31-309.51.23 Fax: 41-31-309.51.50

• SPEAKERS

Mr Ivan PILIP, Minister of Education, Youth and Sport, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport, Karmelitska 8, CZ-118 12 PRAHA 1
Tel: 42-2-519.33.50 Fax: 42-2-311.41.72

M. Jaak AAVIKSOO, Minister of Education, Ministry of Education, 9/11 Tönismägi Str., Tallinn, ESTONIA
Tel: 372.6.28.22.39 Fax: 372.6.31.12.13
or/ou 372.6.22.30.00

Mr Raymond RYBA, Coordinateur Général Axe II: Dossiers pédagogiques, 42 Mosslane, Sale, GB-CHESHIRE M33 6GD
Tel: 44-161-903.29.75 Fax: 44-161-973.55.26

M. Denis KALLEN, Coordinateur général des guides de l'enseignement secondaire pour l'Europe, Les Cigales, 673 chemin des Cigales, F-30250 VILLEVIEILLE
Tel: 33-4-66.80.32.83 Fax: 33-4-66.77.78.81

M. Gabor HALASZ, National Institute of Public Education, Dorottya u.8, P.O.B. 701/420, H-1399 BUDAPEST
Tel: 36-1-118.51.45 Fax: 36-1-118.63.84

Mr Steve HURD, Head of Centre, Centre for Economics and Business Education, Staffordhire University, Leek Road, GB-STOKE ON TRENT ST4 2DF
Tel: 44-1782-29.40.85 Fax: 44-1782-74.70.06

• MEMBRES DU GROUPE DE PROJET "Un enseignement secondaire pour l'Europe"

M. Pierre LUISONI, *Président du Groupe de Projet*, Délégué aux Affaires internationales, Conférence suisse des Directeurs cantonaux de l'Instruction publique (CDIP), Zähringstrasse 25, Case postale 5975, CH - 3001 BERNE
Tel: 41-31-309.51.23 Fax: 41-31-309.51.50

Mr Raymond RYBA, General co-ordinator of the European dimension pedagogical materials programme, 42 Mosslane, Sale, GB-CHESHIRE M33 6GD
Tel: 44-161-903.29.75 Fax: 44-161-973.55.26

M. Denis KALLEN, Coordinateur général des guides de l'enseignement secondaire pour l'Europe, Les Cigales, 673 chemin des Cigales, F-30250 VILLEVIEILLE
Tel: 33-4-66.80.32.83 Fax: 33-4-66.77.78.81

M. Dominique BARTHELEMY, Attaché, Secrétariat Général du Ministère de l'Education, Recherche et Formation, Cellule "Relations Internationales", Cité Administrative de l'Etat, Bld Pacheco 19 , B-1010 BRUXELLES
Tel: 32-2-210.55.29 Fax: 32-2-210.55.38

Mr Zoltàn BÀTHORY, Deputy State Secretary for Public Education, Ministry of Culture and Education, Szalay utca 10-14, H-1884 BUDAPEST Pf. 1
Tel: 36-1-332.11.66 Fax: 36-1-312.80.88

M. César BIRZEA, Directeur, Institut de Sciences de l'Education, 37 rue Stirbei Voda, RO-BUCAREST
Tel: 40-1-613.64.91 Fax: 40-1-312.14.47
ou/or 40-1-312.266.91.85

M. Gabor HALASZ, National Institute of Public Education, Dorottya u.8, P.O.B. 701/420, H-1399 BUDAPEST
Tel: 36-1-118.51.45 Fax: 36-1-118.63.84

Mme Carmen GONZALEZ-MUÑOZ, Inspeccioń Tècnica de Educacioń, C/ Isaac Peval, 23 E-28040 MADRID
Tel: 34-1-549.38.60 Fax: 34-1-544.30.95

Mr Andrzej JANOWSKI, ul. Cybisa 3 m 27, PL-02784 WARSZAWA
Tel: 48-22-64.16.237 Fax: 48-22-62.88.561

M. Jean-Michel LECLERCQ, 47 rue Vavin, F-75006 PARIS
Tel: 33-1-43.26.21.02 Fax: 33-1-43.26.21.02

Mme Annalisa Rosella MILLETTI, Via di Monte Brianzo, 56, I-00186 ROMA
Tel: 39-6-68.67.790 Fax: 39-6-68.80.27.01
or/ou 39-6-68.49.58.35
(Ministère)

Mme Maria Helena ROMAO, Secondary Education Department, Av. 5 de Outubro, 107-7°, P-1050 LISBOA
Tel: 351-1-793.12.91 Fax: 351-1-793.77.02

Mr John SINGH, 88 Shenley Hill, Radlett , GB-HERTS WD7 7BE
Tel: 44-1923-85.69.75 Fax: 44-171-389.44.36

M. Valery TCHINKOV, Expert Principal, 1/37 - 250 Rue Voronezhskaja, MOSCOU 115583
RUSSIE
Tel/Fax: 7-095-924.81.39

Oberstudiendirektor Dr Hans THUM, Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung,
Arabellastr. 1, D-81925 MÜNCHEN
Tel: 49-89-92.14.21.33 Fax: 49-89-92.14.31.24

• MEMBRES STATES OF CDCC

ALBANIA

Mr Fatmir VEJSIU, Director, of Deparment of Secondary Education, Ministry of Education
and Sports, Rruga Kongresi Permitit 23, ALB-TIRANA
Tel: 355-42-320.02 Fax: 355-42-256.78

ANDORRA

Ms Elisenda TELLO, Headteacher in Secondary Education, C. Prat Salit, Santa Coloma,
ANDORRA
Tel: 16-628-868.111 Fax: 16-628-869.111

AUSTRIA

Mr Wolfram HIEBL, Bundesministerium für Unterricht und kulturelle Angelegenheiten, Abt. I/3,
Strozzigasse 6, 2/5, A-1080 WIEN
Tel: 431-531.20.47.00 Fax: 431-531.20.47.80

Mrs Ilsedore WIESER, Prof. Dr., Institut für Erziehnugswissenschaften, Unisersität Innsbruck,
Liebeneggstraße 8, A-6020 INNSBRUCK
Tel: 431-512.507.40.41 Fax: 431-512.507.28.80

Mr Jürgen HORSCHINEGG, Bundesministerium für Unterricht und kulturelle Angelegenheiten,
Abt. II/5, Minoritenplatz 5, A-1010 WIEN
Tel: 431-531.20.44.24 Fax: 431-531.20.41.30

BELARUS

Mr Alexander ZHUK, Rector of the Institute for Qualification Improvement and Retraining of
the Leading Teaching Staff, Ulyanovskaya str. 8, 2206 00 MINSK
Tel: 375-172.26.00.50
or/ou 375-172.26.13.06

BELGIUM

Communauté flamande:

M. W. DEWILDE, Inspecteur S.O., Koninginnelaan 65 Bus 7, B-8400 OOSTENDE
Tel/fax: 32-59-80.05.38

Mme M. VAN STEENVOORT, Inspecteur S.O., Marcel De Backerstraat 24,
B-2180 EKEREN
Tel/fax: 32-3-664.58.55

M. P. MICHIELSENS, Inspecteur generaal, Rijksadministratief Centrum, Arcadengebouw Blok F - K. 5104, B-1010 BRUSSEL
Tel: 32-2-210.53.22 Fax: 32-2-210.53.08

Communauté française:

Mme Marcella COLLE-MICHEL, Inspectrice, Ministère de l'Education, Secrétariat général Cité Administrative de l'Etat, Bureau 7545, 7e étage, 19 Bd Pacheco, B-1010 BRUXELLES
Tel: 32-4-342.49.16 Fax: 32-2-210.55.38

M. Louis MANIQUET, Directeur Général de l'Enseignement Secondaire, Ministère de l'Education, Recherche et Formation, 19 Boulevard Pachéco, B-1010 BRUXELLES
Tel: 32-2-210.55.93 Fax: 32-2-210.58.18

M. Jean RAVEZ, Inspecteur Général, Cité Administrative de l'Etat, 19 Boulevard Pachéco, B-1010 BRUXELLES

BULGARIA

Mme Sofia DIMITROVA, Chef du Département Documentation Pédagogique pour l'Enseignement Secondaire, Ministère de l'Education, de la Science et des Technologies, Blvd Dondoukov 2A, BG-1000 SOFIA
Tel: 35-92-81.49.12 Fax: 35-92-88.25.94

CZECH REPUBLIC

Mr Pavel CINK, Director of the Department of Foreign Relations, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Karmelitská 7, CZ-118 12 PRAHA 1
Tel: 42-2-519.37.00 Fax: 42-2-519.33.97

Mr Hynek KRÁTKÝ, Senior Director for Primary and Upper Secondary General Education, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Karmelitská 7, CZ-118 12 PRAHA 1
Fax: 42-2-519.33.97

Mr Zdeněk HELUS, Faculty of Education, Charles University, M.D. Rettigové 4,
CZ-116 39 PRAHA 1
Tel: 42-2-29.78.70 Fax: 42-2-29.02.25

CYPRUS

Mr Andreas PAPASTAVROU, Chief Education Officer, Ministry of Education and Culture, Y-1434 NICOSIA
Tel: 357-230.81.17 Fax: 357-259.09.32

CROATIA

Mrs Vera JAVOR, Head of School, XV gimnazija, Jordanovac 8, HR-10 000 ZAGREB
Tel: 385-1-228.488 Fax: 385-1-221.564

DENMARK

Mr Henrik TAUBER, Educational Adviser, Department of Primary and Lower Secondary Education, Frederiksholms Kanal 26, DK-1220 KØBENHAVN K
Tel: 45-33-92.53.00 Fax: 45-33-92.53.02

Mr Erik NEXELMANN, Ministry of Education, H.C. Andersens Boulevard 43,
DK-1553 KØBENHAVN V
Tel: 45-33-92.56.86 Fax: 45-33-92.56.59

Mrs Else PADE, National Adviser, Department of Upper Secondary Education, Frederiksholms Kanal 25B, DK-1220 KØBENHAVN K
Tel: 45-33-92.56.00 Fax: 45-33-92.56.08

ESTONIA

Ms Kersti KALDMA, Head of Curriculum Division, Department of Primary and Secondary Education, Ministry of Education, Tönimägi 9/11, TALLINN-EE 0100
Tel: 372-6-282.238 Fax: 372-6-311.213

FINLAND

Mr Jouko KÖNNÖLA, Special Government Advisor, Ministry of Education, P.O. Box 293,
FIN-00171 HELSINSKI
Tel: 358-9-13.41.72.52 Fax: 358-9-13.41.69.84

Mr Pentti TAKALA, Director, National Board of Education, P.O. Box 380,
FIN-00530 HELSINKI
Tel: 358-9-77.47.72.64 Fax: 358-9-77.47.73.45

FRANCE

M. Gilles FOURNIER, Sous-Directeur des Formations Générales et Technologiques à la Direction des Lycées et Collèges (DCL), Ministère de l'Education Nationale, de l'Enseignement de Supérieur et de la Recherche, 107 rue de Grenel, F-75007 PARIS
Tel: 33-1-49.55.10.32 Fax: 33-1-49.55.38.92

Mme Marie-Josée de FORNEL, Ministère de l'Education Nationale, de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche, 173 Boulevard Saint-Germain, F-75006 PARIS
Tel: 33-1-40.65.66.89 Fax: 33-1-45.44.01.38

M. Roland EYERCHET, Chargé de Mission Europe, Lycée d'Enseignement Général et Technologique agricole, F-68250 ROUFACH
Tel: 33-3-89.78.73.00/73.15 Fax: 33-3-89.78.73.01

GERMANY

Dr Klaus BREIDING, Regierungsdirektor, Hessisches Kultusministerium, Luisenplatz 10,
D -65185 WIESBADEN
Tel: 49-611-36.82.514 Fax: 49-611-36.82.099

Mr Herbert STRAZNY, Studiendirektor, Ministerium für Schule und Weiterbildung, Völkinger Str. 49a, D-40211 DÜSSELDORF
Tel: 49-211-89.63.316 Fax: 49-211-89.63.220

GREECE

M. Christoforos CHARALAMBAKIS, Professor of Linguistics, University of Athens, Department of Education, 44, Hippokratous str., GR-10680 ATHENS
Tel: 30.1.364. 07.19 Fax: 30.1.881.07.35

HOLY SEE

Révérend Père Guglielmo MALIZIA, s.d.b., Université Pontificale Salésienne, Piazza dell'Ateneo Salesiano, I-00139 ROMA
Tel: 39-6-87.29.03.49 Fax: 39-6-87.29.06.58

HUNGARY

Mr Gábor BOLDIZÁR, Directeur Adjoint du Département des Affaires Européennes et des Organisations Internationales, POB 1, H-1884 BUDAPEST
Tel/fax: 361-331.05.99

IRELAND

Ms Margaret CONDON, Post-primary Inspector, Department of Education, Post-primary Inspectorate, Room 308B, 3rd Floor, Hawkins House, Hawkins Street,
IRL-DUBLIN 2
Tel: 353-1-873.47.00 ext.2587 Fax: 353-1-677.73.42

ITALY

Mme Maria Vittoria BALDIERI, Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Chef de la Division de la coopération multilatéraleDirection générale des échanges culturels, Div. V, Via Ippolito Nievo 35, I-00153 ROMA
Tel: 39-6-58.49.58.50 Fax: 39-6-58.49.58.35

M. Vincenzo MICOCCI, General Inspector, Division de la coopération multilatérale, Direction générale des échanges culturels, Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Via Ippolito Nievo 35, I-00153 ROMA
Tel: 39-6-58.49.58.12 Fax: 39-6-58.49.58.35

M. Giunio LUZZATTO, Professor University of Genova, CARED, Piazza S. Sabina 2,
I-16124 GENOVA
Tel: 39.10.209.59.64 Fax: 39.10.209.59.61

LATVIA

Mr Nils SAKSS, Director of Department of Strategic Planning, Ministry of Education and Science, Valnu str 2, LV-1098 RIGA
Tel: 371-7-22.24.15 Fax: 371-7-21.39.92

LIECHTENSTEIN

M. Guido WOLFINGER, Leiter des Schulamtes, Herrengasse 2, FL-9490 VADUZ,
FURSTENTUM LIECHTENSTEIN
Tel: 41-75-236.67.51 Fax: 41-75-236.67.71

LITHUANIA

Mr Žibartas JACKŪNAS, Director of Institute of Pedagogics, M. Kartkaus Str. 44,
LT-2600 VILNIUS
Tel: 370-2-75.15.72 Fax: 370-2-72.43.15

LUXEMBOURG

M. Mil JUNG, Conseiller de Gouvernement 1ère classe, Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de la Formation Professionnelle, 29 rue Aldringen, L-2926 LUXEMBOURG
Tel: 352-478-51.38 Fax: 352-478-51.46

M. Jérôme LEVY, Sociologue Diplômé, MA, Service de Coordination de Recherche et , Innovation Pédagogiques et Technologiques (SCRIPT), Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de la Formation Professionnelle, 29, rue Aldringen, L-2926 LUXEMBOURG
Tel: 352-478-51.89 Fax: 352-478-51.37

M. Robert BOHNERT, Directeur du Lycée Classique et Technique de Diekirch/Mersch, Secrétaire du Collège des Directeurs de l'Enseignement Secondaire, 32 avenue de la Gare, L-9233 DIEKIRCH
Tel: 352-80-32.18 Fax: 352-80-95.84

M. Jeannot HANSEN, Professeur-attaché, Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de la Formation Professionnelle, 29, rue Aldringen, L-2926 LUXEMBOURG
Tel: 352-478-51.28 Fax: 352-478-51.30

MALTA

Mr Charles MIZZI, Director Curriculum Management, Student services and international relations, Education Division, Ministry of Education, FLORIANA CMR 02
Tel: 356-24.51.72 Fax: 356-22.06.39

MOLDOVA

M. Simion MUSTEATA, Premier Vice-Ministre, Ministère de l'Education,Piata Marii Adunari Nationale, 1, CHISINAU MD-2033
Tel/fax: 373-2-23.34.74

THE NETHERLANDS

Mrs Marianne NIJDAM - VO/TAB, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Room J 321, Station 343, P.O. Box 25000, NL - ZOETERMEER
Tel: 31-79-323.46.42 Fax: 31-79-323.23.20
ou/or 31-79-323.26.35

NORWAY

Mr Toralf TVEITEN, Director, National Education Office in West Agder, Tinghuset, N-4605 KRISTIANSAND
Tel: 47-38-07.62.65 Fax: 47-38-07.60.15

Ms Tone LOGE, Assistant Director General, Ministry of Education, Postboks 8119 Dep., N-0032 OSLO
Tel: 47-22-24.76.10 Fax: 47-22-24.95.41

Mr Roar GRØTTVIK, Senior Adviser, Teachers Union Norway, Wergelandsveien 15, N-0167 OSLO
Tel: 47-22-03.00.00 Fax: 47-22-11.05.42

Ms Ellen Marie SKAFLESTAD, Adviser, Ministry of Education, Postboks 8119 Dep.
N-0032 OSLO
Tel: 47-22-24.75.13 Fax: 47-22-24.27.32

Ms Anne Lise AWADH, Adviser, Ministry of Education, Postboks 8119 Dep.
N-0032 OSLO
Tel: 47-22-24.76.50 Fax: 47-22-24.27.15

POLAND

Mr Miroslaw SAWICKI, Sous-secrétaire d'Etat et Vice-Ministre de l'Education, Ministerstwo, Edukacji Narodowej, Al. Szucha 25, PL-00918 WARSZAWA
Tel/fax: 48-22-622.36.84

PORTUGAL

Mr João SANTOS, Chef de Cabinet de la Secrétaire d'Etat, Av. Outubro, 5, 107-9°,
P-1000 LISBOA
Tel: 351-1-795.09.73 Fax: 351-1-793.25.04

M. Domingos FERNANDES, Directeur du Département de l'Enseignement secondaire,
Av. Junho, 24, 138-6°, P-1350 LISBOA
Tel: 351-1-60.61.26 Fax: 351-1-397.40.42

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Mr Vladimir MOSTROV, Director Advisor, Ministry of Education and Physical Culture, Pedagogical Institute of Macedonia, ut. Rudjer Bošković, bb, 9100 SKOPJE
Tel: 389.91.361.166 Fax: 389.91.361.057

Mrs Milka MASNIKOSA, Senior Counselor, Ministry of Education and Physical Culture, Veljko Vlahovic 9, 9100 SKOPJE
Tel: 389-91.117.896 Fax: 389-91.118.414

RUSSIA

M. Serguey SHISHOV, Head Department of educational standards and programms, Ministry of Education, 6 Chistoprudny Blvd, 101856 MOSCOW
Tel: 7-095-923.87.12 Fax: 7-095-924.69.89

SAN MARINO

Dr Riccardo STEFANELLI, Coordinatore Dipartimento Istruzione, Cultura e Giustizia Contrada Omerelli, 47031 SAN MARINO
Tel: 378.88.22.62 Fax: 378.88.23.01

Dr Mario DUPUIS, Consulente Dicastero Pubblica Istruzione, Cultura e Giustizia Contrada Omerelli, 47031 SAN MARINO
Tel: 378.88.22.62 Fax: 378.88.23.01

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Mrs Silvia MATÚŠOVÁ, Director, Štátny pedagogický ústav, Pluhová 8,
SK-830 00 BRATISLAVA
Tel: 427-397.731 Fax: 427-397.792

SLOVENIA

Ms Viljana LUKAS, Undersecretary, Head of the Department of International Co-operation, Ministry of Education and Sport, Župančičeva 6, SL-1000 LJUBLJANA
Tel: 386-61-132.32.25 Fax: 386-61-132.72.12

Ms Andreja BARLE, Councellor to the Director, National Curriculum Unit, Ministry of Education and Sport, Trubarjeva 5, SL-1000 LJUBLJANA
Tel: 386-61-131.71.36 Fax: 386-61-332.437

Mrs Darja PICIGA, Head of the Centre for Research on learning and Educational Research Institute, Gerbičeva 62, SL-1111 LJUBLJANA
Tel: 386-61-331.210 Fax: 386-61-331.637

Mr Sergis GABRSCEK, National examinations Centre, Podmilscakova 25, SL-1000 LJUBLJANA
Tel: 386-61-13 22 103 Fax: 386-61-32 70 68
e-mail: Sergis.Gabrscek@guest.arnes.si

SPAIN

M. Gregorio GONZALEZ, Director del Gabinete Técnico de la Secretaría General de Educación y Formación Profesional, C/Alcalá 34, E-MADRID
Tel: 34-1-532.88.68 Fax: 34-1-521.37.75

M. Juan Luis CORDERO, Consejero Técnico del Gabinete Técnico de la Secretaría General de Educación y Formación Profesional, C/Alcalá 34, E-MADRID
Tel: 34-1-532.34.37 Fax: 34-1-521.37.75

SWEDEN

Mr Mikael ALEXANDERSSON, Ph. D., Inst. for Metodik, G U, Box 1010
S-431 26 MOLINDAL
Tel: 46-322.611.420 Fax: 46-322.39909

Mr Oscar ÖQUIST, Director of Education, National Agency for Education,
S-106 20 STOCKHOLM
Tel: 46-8-723.33.34 Fax: 46-8-24.44.20

Mr Sonja HJORTH, Deputy Assistant Under-Secretary, Ministry of Education and Science, Division for schools, S-103 33 STOCKHOLM
Tel: 46-8-405.17.87 Fax: 46-8-405.19.09

SWITZERLAND

M. Roger SAUTHIER, Président du groupe AGYM, rue de Lausanne, 54, CH-1950 SION
Tel: 41-27-322.32.55 Fax: 41-27-606.20.51

M. Raymond JOURDAN, Directeur du Collège Clarapède, Chemin de Fossard 61, CH-1231 CONCHES
Tel: 41-22-347.66.77 Fax: 41-22-346.05.65

Mme Christine KÜBLER, Présidente de la Commission pédagogique de la CDIP, 34 rue de la Rebatte, CH-2068 HAUTERIVE
Tel: 41-31-309.51.11 Fax: 41-31-309.51.50

M. Emil WETTSTEIN, Amt für Berufsbildung, Postfach, CH-8090 ZURICH
Tel: 41-1-273.19.41 Fax: 41-1-273.19.15

M. Christian ERARD, Président de la Commission romande pour la dimension européenne, CO de la Broye, CH-1774 COUSSET
Tel: 41-37-61.45.66 Fax: 41-37-61.53.43

TURKEY

M. Fikri ALTAY, Attaché de l'Education, Consulat Général de Turquie, 10 rue Auguste Lamey, F-67000 STRASBOURG
Tel: 33-3-88.52.97.09 Fax: 33-3-88.52.97.09

UKRAINE

Mr Boris CHIZEVSKY, Head of the Division of the New Types of Schools, Ministry of Education, 10 Peremogy Avenue, UA-252135 KYIV
Tel: 380-44-216.11.28 Fax: 380-44-274.41.53

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr David TAYLOR, Head of Teacher Education and Training, Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), Room 801, Alexandra House, 29-33 Kingsway,
GB-LONDON WCIB 6SE
Tel: 44-171-421.66.95 Fax: 44-171-421.66.97

Mr Chris JONES, Assistant Chief Executive, School Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Newcombe House, 45 Notting Hill Gate, GB-LONDON W11 3JB
Tel: 44-171-229.12.34 Fax: 44-171-243.10.60

Dr Jack JACKSON, HM Staff Inspector of schools, room H1-6, Soughton House, Broomhouse Drive, Edinburgh, EH11 3XD, Scotland
Tel: 131-244.83.24 Fax: 131-244.84.24

Mr John BIRCH, Staff Inspector, Department of Education - Nothern Ireland, Rathgael House, Balloo Road, GB - BANGOR BT19 2PR
Tel: 44-1247-27.91.00 Fax: 44-1247-27.96.97

• OBSERVERS

ARMENIA

M. Samvel LALAYAN, Deuxième Secrétaire du Département de l'Europe M. A. E., 4 Rue Tadevossian App. 28, 375055 ARMENIE
Tel: 374-2-50.58.21 Fax: 374-2-52.70.22

• INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Mrs Arlette DELHAXHE, Head of the Scientific Team, Unit Eurydice, Directorate General XXII, Education, Training and Youth, Rue de la Loi, 200, B-1049 BRUSSELS

OECD

Mr Alan WAGNER, Administator, Education and Training Division, 2 rue du Conseiller Collignon, F-75006 PARIS
Tel: 33-1.45.24.91.67 Fax: 33-4.45.24.90.98

UNESCO

Mr Richard HALPERIN, Chief of the section for secondary and teacher education, division for the renovation of secondary and vocational education, education sector, 7 place de Fontenoy, F-75352 PARIS 07 SP
Tel: 33.1.45.68.08.23 Fax: 33.1.45.68.56.22

• COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Parliamentary Asssembly

Mr Jan KOUCKÝ, Member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Advisor of Minister, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport, Karmelitská 7, 118 12 PRAHA 1 - Czech Republic
Tel: 42-2-519.33.57 Fax: 42-2-531.597

Comité Directeur Européen pour la Coopération intergouvernementale dans le domaine de la Jeunesse (CDEJ)

Mme A.M. FARADJI, Administratrice, CDEJ, Conseil de l'Europe, CEJ, 30 rue Pierre de Coubertin, F-67000 STRASBOURG
Tel: 33-3-88.41.21.30 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.78

CDCC

Mme Tanja OREL-STURM, Chair of the CDCC, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department for International Relations, Gregorciceva 25, SL-1000 LJUBLJANA

Heritage Committee

M. Serge GRAPPIN, Directeur, Maison du Patrimoine, F-21190 SAINT-ROMAIN
Professeur, Service DEAPID - Action Culturelle, RECTORAT, F-21000 DIJON
Tel: 33-3-80.21.28.50 Fax: 33-3-80.21.24.99

High Education Research Committee

Mr Wolfgand MÖNIKES, Chair of the C-HER, Leiter des Referats 311, Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie, Heinemannstr. 2, Postfach 200108, D - 53170 BONN
Tel: 49-228-57.22.30 Fax: 49-228-57.20.96

• NON GOVERNEMENTAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Commission de liaison des O. N. G. et Regroupement des O. N. G. Education

Père Gilbert CAFFIN, représentant, 5 Rue Trubner, F-67000 STRASBOURG
Tel. 33-3-88.35.03.90 Fax: 33-3-88.36.70.74

Office International de l'Enseignement Catholique (O.I.E.C.)

Mme Bénédicte de SAINT-AMAND, 5 rue Trubner, F-67000 STRASBOURG
Tel: 33-3-88.22.08.50 Fax: 33-3-88.75.98.13

Organisation internationale pour le développement de la liberté d'enseignement (O.I.D.E.L.)

M. Alfred FERNANDEZ, 32 rue de l'Athénée, CH-1206 GENEVE
Tel: 41-22-789.29.49 Fax: 41-22-789.29.22

Ligue Française de l'Enseignement et de l'Education Permanente (L.I.E.E.C.P.)

M. Christian VANDENBERGHEN, Chargé de Mission, Inspection de l'enseignement secondaire, Centre administratif, Bd Anspach, 6, 14e étage, B-1000 BRUXELLES
Tel: 32-2-279.38.81 Fax: 32-2-279.39.91

Organisation du Baccalauréat International

M. Ian HILL, Regional Director for Europe/Africa/Middle East, 15 route des Morillons, CH-1218 GRAND SACONNEX/GENEVE
Tel: 41-22-791.02.74 Fax: 41-22-791.02.77

European Showmen's-Union (E.S.U.)

Mr Ludo KNAEPKENS, Director of EFECOT, European Federation for the Education of the Children of Occupational Travellers, Rue Guimard 17, B-1040 BRUSSELS
Tel: 32-2-502.54.99 Fax: 32-2-502.34.94

Union Mondiale ORT

M. Urias ARANTES, 11 Avenue du Général de Gaulle, F-67000 STRASBOURG
Tel: 33-3-88.61.26.73 Fax: 33-3-88.76.74.74

Eurotalent

M. Justin SCHLEGEL, 55 Allée de la Robertsau, F-67000 STRASBOURG
Tel: 33-3-88.36.14.06 Fax: 33-3-88.37.96.75

Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Français (F.I.P.F.)

M. Peter EHRHARD, Représentant de la F.I.P.F.,Ringstrasse 6, CH-4614 HAEGENDORF
Tel: 41-62-216.28.19 Fax: 41-62-216.54.34

Association européenne pour l'éducation aux médias audiovisuels (A.E.E.M.A.)

M. Didier SCHRETTER, Président, Avenue Maréchal Foch 54, B-1030 BRUXELLES
Tel/fax: 32-2-241.20.03

Fédération Européenne des Ecoles (F.E.D.E.)

Mr D. Juan JIMENEZ, Colegio Internacional SEK-EL CASTILLO, Urbanización Villafranca del Castillo, Castillo de Alarcón, 49, E-28692 MADRID
Tel: 91.815.08.92 Fax: 91.815.11.40

European Federation for Intercultural Learning (E.F.I.L.)

Mr Dietrich GROSS, Studiendirektor, Berater für Internationalen Bildungsaustausch, Am Berghang 30, D-53229 BONN
Tel/fax: 49-228-948.31.95

Confédération Syndicale Mondiale de l'Enseignement (C.S.M.E.)

M. Gaston DE LA HAYE, 33 rue de Trèves, B-1040 BRUXELLES
Tel: 32.2.285.47.52 Fax: 32.2.230.87.22

• SECRETARIAT OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport

M. Raymond WEBER, Directeur
Tel: 33-3-88.41.26.85 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Mr Maitland STOBART, Deputy Director/Head of the'Education Department
Tel: 33-3-88.41.26.06 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Ms Ulrike SCHOLL, Administratrice
Tel: 33-3-88.41.30.73 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Ms Gudrun AHLIN, Director of Education, National Agency for Education, Kungsgatan 53, S-106 20 STOCKHOLM

Secretariat du Comité de l'Education

M. Jean-Pierre TITZ, Secrétaire du Comité de l'Education
Tel: 33-3-88.41.26.09 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Ms Judy BUTLER, Assistant
Tel: 33-3-88.41.35.29 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Section de l'Education scolaire et extrascolaire

M. Domenico RONCONI, Chef de la Section
Tel: 33-3-88.41.26.35 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Ms Verena TAYLOR, Administratrice
Tel: 33-3-88.41.23.12 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Mme Claude PARVE-PUYDARRIEUX, Assistante Administrative Principale
Tel: 33-3-88.41.26.21 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Mlle Lisa CITTONE, Assistante Administrative Principale
Tel: 33.88.41.26.20 Fax: 33-3-88-41.27.88/27.06

Mr Robert BLACKWELL, Assistant Administratif
Tel: 33-3-88.41.39.64 Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Mme Catherine MALARD, Assistante Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06
Tel: 33-3-88.41.37.52

Mme Anita LAJMI, Assistante
Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06
Tel: 33-3.88.41.29.27

Mme Anne BRUNELLIERE, Assistante
Tel: 33-3-88.41.35.23
Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06

Ms Susan CONN, Assistant
Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06
Tel: 33-3-88.41.35.64

M. Philippe THOMAS, Stagiaire
Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06
Tel: 33-3-88.41.39.64

Section des Langues Vivantes

Mme Carole REICH, Administratrice
Tel: 33-3-88.41.22.45
Fax: 33-3-88.41.27.88/27.06